...IENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

...EMENT FOR 1945-1948

President

...olville, G. C. I. E., T. D., Governor of Bombay

Vice-Presidents

...t Pratinidhi, B A, C B E., Rajasaheb of Aundh.

...rao alias Appasaheb Patwardhan,
Rajasaheb of Sangli

... Mudhojirao alias Nanasaheb Naik Nimbalkar,
Raja Bahadur of Phaltan.

...rao Shankarrao alias Babasaheb Pandit
Pant Sachiv, Rajasaheb of Bhor

K. S. Jatar, Esq., C.I.E.

Sir G. D. Madgaonkar, I.C.S. (Retd.)

Dr. Sir R. P. Paranjpye, M. A., D.Sc.

N. C. Kelkar, Esq., B.A., LL B.

REGULATING COUNCIL for 1945-1948

Chairman *

Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, B. A., C. B. E., Rajasaheb of Aundh

Vice-Chairman *

Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, M. A., F. R. A. S. B.

Prof. K. V. Abhyankar, M. A.
Dr. A. S. Altekar, M. A., LL.B., D. Litt.
Dr. V. M. Apte, M. A., Ph. D.
Dr. P. V. Bapat, M. A., Ph. D.
†Dr. V. G. Bhat, M. A., Ph. D
Prof. N. G. Damle, M.A.
Prin. S. V. Dandekar, M. A.
Dr. S. K. De, M. A., D. Litt
Prin. D. R. Gadgil, M. A., M. Litt.
Mm. Prof. P. V. Kane, M. A., LL. M.
Prof. R. D. Karmarkar, M.A.
Dr. Mrs. Irawati Karve, M. A., Ph. D.
Mr. N. C. Kelkar, B. A., LL. B.
Prof. R. D. Laddu, M. A.
Hon'ble Mr. Justice N. S. Lokur, B. A., LL. B.
Mm. Prin. V. V. Mirashi, M. A., LL. B.
Dr. V. G. Paranjpe, M. A., LL.B., D.Litt.
Prof. D. V. Potdar, B. A.
Prof. R. D. Vadekar, M.A.
Prof. H. D. Velankar, M. A.

Joint Trustees

Sardar G. N. Mujumdar, C. I. E.
Diwan Bahadur K. M. Jhaveri, M. A., LL. B.

EXECUTIVE BOARD for 1945-48

Prin. J. R. Gharpure, B. A., LL. B. (*Chairman*)
Dr. R. N. Dandekar, M. A., Ph. D. (*Secretary*)
Prof. R. G. Bhadkamkar, M. A. (*Treasurer*)
Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, M.A., Ph.D.
Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, M.A.
†Prof. A. B. Gajendragadkar, M.A., M. B. E.
†Dr. S. M. Katre, M.A., Ph.D.
†Dr. M. B. Rehman, M.A., Ph.D.
Dr. P. L. Vaidya, M.A., D. Litt.

*To be elected annually   † Nominated by Government.

CONTENTS

VOLUME XXVI, PARTS I-II

(4-2-1946)

Annals of the
Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute

VOL. XXVI] JANUARY-APRIL 1945 [PARTS I-II

SCIENCE IN RELATION TO SOCIETY *

BY
S. V. PUNTAMBEKAR

Introductory

I must thank you sincerely for having invited me to speak here to-day On this occasion I wish to pay my humble tribute to the memory of the late Sir Ramakrishna Bhandarkar in whose name this Research Institute is founded, to the scholarly work which it is doing, and to the great scholars who are doing it. Their attempt to preserve, interpret, and bring to light our old but ever-new learning owes its inspiration to the great truths and teachings embodied in it

The early creative mind of India is represented in the Vedas, the Upanisads and the two historical epics, namely, the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata, each of them is unique in form and content, not easily paralleled in any other literature. They represent a fathomless spiritual insight at work, a subtle and intuitive vision, and a deep and clear, intellectual and ethical thinking and heroic action which has made the permanent structure of our culture and civilisation possible.

In the long course of our history and culture the literature which has inspired, guided, and controlled our life has been the Vedic and the Epic. Its moral and intellectual depth, its social and religious contents have been our priceless treasures and our

* This paper was read on 6th July 1945, the Foundation Day of the Institute.

eternal sources of national inspiration and action, greatness and glory.

But now we find that there is an apathy towards its study. There is a decided turn towards studying only modern new sciences—physical and technological, biological and sociological. If the old knowledge is studied it is studied only for its comparative or historical value. It is considered to belong to a bygone age and to possess hardly any contemporary value

There are two questions to be asked here, (1) is the man of to-day superior intellectually and morally, and greater in social stature and economic happiness than the one of the Vedic and Epic or our classical age? and (2) are the sciences of to-day more advanced and determinate in their social direction and values?

A new era of planning or what I call "plansichy" is being ushered in by scientists and technologists politicians and statesman to remove human misery and social anarchy in the old world of to-day and to build up a new world of to-morrow In this, science, pure and applied, is going to play a dominating part in reorganising our material life and moral welfare Our politicians are utilising the services of scientific experts in this matter. The problem before us is therefore can science alone secure these purposes without the help of ethics and religion which primarily give us our values of human life Is the position of these planners who are devotees or advocates of science and who adopt an air of ethical superiority correct? Will science by itself give or lead us to ethical values and human welfare? Is it alone concerned with the welfare of humanity?

My argument may be summarised as follows In the changing world of to-day there is a great moral gulf between the powers which scientific knowledge gives and the values which society pursues or ought to pursue. There is no balance between the power possessed and the good sought This is what I want to show in my address to-day on "Science in relation to society

Our world is a four-fold world—of science, morals, religious and art—which is ever changing and expanding Unless

their interrelation is properly maintained, and a harmony between them is created in the process, our world will not be happy and rise in human stature.

Therefore I intend to examine the influence of science on social living, and also the nature and scope of social and natural sciences.

To-day we are living in a sick world Can science alone help us out of it? Our needs are not only physical and mental, but also moral and spiritual We have to harmonise them all. No doubt science has affected our outlook and judgment but its scope or province is limited. Its pointer readings are provisional and relative There are values in life which are independent of science. They are given by other studies and inner experiences. Finally can science as such make a contribution to the good life of man?

Science in relation to Society

To-day under the name of science a number of pseudo social, sciences are developing and taking possession of society and trying to change or revolutionise it. They try to create a new historical science, a new ethical science, a new economic science, a new political science and a new social science based upon certain fundamental assumptions or ideas about matter and mind, body and soul, and the origin and development, the end and purpose, the causation and course of man and his institutions and beliefs. They increase flexibly the scope of science so as to include ethics, religion, art in it They determine rigidly the course of its development so as to exclude other possibilities inherent or desirable in it They put their own fixed values above truth or call them the truth.

They call the modern age as the regime or common-wealth of science which they believe is bound to lead us to a golden age in the future. I consider this view point as distorted and the "isms" which promote it and propagate it as perverting the view of science and the scope of knowledge and good given by it. Most of them are neither science, nor history nor sociology, and may be regarded as pseudo-scientific rubbish. They use the terminology of science merely to propagate their own dogmas. There seems nothing really scientific about them.

Science does not and cannot cover all the creative aspects, experience and aspirations of human life. It possesses no criteria to teach us the values of human life. If science claims that man can know and also direct and control his moral world or world destiny, there is no proof for it in 1945 nor was there before it. Nature is intrinsically and in its elements neither understandable nor subject to law, and science cannot discover any ultimates even in its own realm. The world can only be described as a ceaseless flow and fluctuation of an invisible force or tide. The world is not purely a world of reason To-day social Darwinism is discredited, and pre-determined progressivism is considered wishful thinking We cannot therefore treat history and sociology as merely biographies of certain ideas and laws, dogmas or beliefs nor as manifestations of certain social patterns and their wish for changes. All the 19th century sociologists and social evolutionists like Comte and Spencer, Marx and Morgan have committed this mistake. Actual historical sequences do not run true to any particular form or law They are not their inevitable consequences Their rigid concepts and dialectial dichotomies or patterns of natural and human life are very unscientific Modern natural and human sciences are against these conceptual rigidities and dichotomies of nature and life.

They recognise that there are past facts and factors which are not as yet properly known, and there are present facts and factors which are new and unknown, therefore future facts and factors cannot be easily, completely or correctly known. Human thought can never exhaust the great reality and totality of time and space philosophical and historical which are themselves expanding.

Moreover, the psychical is not entirely under the heel or control of the physical causality. Psychical life is capable of continually forming new contents or taking leaps out of given elements by its power of intellectual analysis and creative synthesis. Man is not a generalised being. He is always something more, independent, unknown and unique He is not a mere functionary. He stands on a midway between freedom and determinism. There is no such thing as dichotomy or antithesis between the individual and the society and its various changing groups.

We have to admit that a world of transcendental thought actually exists alongside the existence of the physical world, and there is something far more in the shape of values, essences, universals, than can be apprehended through empirical consciousness. We cannot presuppose the identity of the subject and the object which make dogmatic and materialistic philosophies of to-day possible, we do not believe in either the subject devouring the object as the idealist does or the object devouring the subject as the materialist does Science through controlled description, experimentation and inference aims at logical and consistent hypotheses and generalisations or laws of bahaviour. On their basis we are asked to predict and to control our behaviour This has led to the development of the concept of types and patterns, ignoring the recognition of the unique and specific features of human behaviour. But the process of induction has a limited value. It can only generalise from a limited field of particulars. Therefore its general is also a generalised particular, and cannot be the universal. To-day there is a revolution in science Matter in the sense of spatial substance has ceased to exist. Fundamental ideas of matter and motion have changed. Matter is alive, is energy. Matter-mind is considered as an inspired something in motion and action Science is found unable to lead us to the knowledge of its substance. It is only a method of knowing its stucture. It creates a conceptual model by which we briefly resume our experience of known facts. It cannot give us judgments of the reality but only of its relativity and relations It merely gives us a concise statement of *how* changes are taking place. It cannot explain *why* they have taken place in particular ways. The aim of science is now ceasing to be the discovery of cause and effect, because the universe is being considered a sum of phenomena, some of which are more, others less, closely contingent on each other. This conception is wider than that of causality. Some assert that no phenomena are causal and all phenomena are contingent. The problem before us is therefore to measure the degree of this contingency which lies between the zero (individuality) of independence and the unity (commonness) of causation.

It is held to-day that beyond and superior to the physical world lies the world of value characterised by a spiritual unity which is absent from purely material phenomena. Therefore life can be understood only from the standpoint of values which are given by great or inspired men The extrinsic analysis of science fails to differentiate between human values and environmental or structural relations, between thought as a function of society and thought as a function in society.

Science reasons from quantity, experience and commonness. It explains relations and processes and results in relative or rigid abstractions and generalisations Scientific process as one puts it merely 'unifies', 'mobilises' and 'levels' what is observed and demonstrable. Moral process reasons from quality, experience and uniqueness It gives concrete values, and by its valuational function 'divides', 'specialises' and 'arranges' in order of merit from what is experienced and unstandable. (Dilthey's *erlebnis* and *verstehen*).

Shall we start with a proposition like Rousseau's " Man is born like an animal but proposes to live as an angel. " What should be his method? We shall have to find it out, with the help of the real knowledge of nature and of the actual life of man in history. Our knowledge is ever increasing and our life is ever expanding There is no settled balance or harmony between the discoveries of one and the desires of the other At present there has arisen a great moral gulf between the powers which knowledge gives and the purposes which our life pursues. To bridge it we cannot accept the easy and cheap unilinear solutions propounded by scientists and socialists as the last world of science or moral living They prove to be inadequate, as they ignore some of the facts and values of life, distort others and fail to distinguish between the common and the unique

We are today hearing the swan-song of a passing world, an age of definite values and untroubled certitudes. Each age has its dominant note and outlook, and its dominant interests and preoccupation. It has its own mentality and moral climate. But new facts and factors have arisen in our epoch. They are stubborn and living Our new knowledge and experience, material

and mental, and our new views and values, moral and social, are all in conflict with the old order of knowledge and life. Our epoch is not homogeneous mentally and morally. There is a new revolution created by scientists and a new revelation propounded by socialists in both these spheres A minority of scientists and socialists have ushered in a new era in technology and ideology, an epoch of new orders to be created in the material, mental and moral life of man Science as a whole with its developments in physical, biological and psychological studies, and philosophy in its total valuations in the fields of anthropology, anthropogeo graphy and sociology have both created a new world of natural powers and social values, which now require to be studied, correlated and harmonised for our good. This is what we mean by " Science in relation to Society. "

Our scientific knowledge is new and advanced. Our social life has become close and complex Therefore we have to adjust them both in the interests of the great society which is taking shape. But we must not start with fixed solutions and determinate laws Whatever does not fit in their scheme we must not ignore, deride or discard Ours is not an age of one-eyed reason and monocled vision, ignoring the variety and depth of human life We have to look to the facts of human sufferings and needs, and also to the demands of human nature and values, in order to estimate and to propose the course of life which we should follow. We are living today in a fourfold world of knowledge and action. It is a world of science with the powers and perils it generates, a world of morals with the loves and hatreds it harbours, a world of religion with the confidences and consolations it creates, and a world of arts and crafts with the intuition and cunning it possesses. Every aspect of our thought and life is subject to and surrounded by one or other of these worlds or even by all. The contents and drives of these worlds are ever increasing. Those with limited understanding and rigid out-look consider one or the other as more important, and their one or the other stage as more true, while the problem before humanity is to recognise, understand and experience their disciplines as a whole. It is one of the most difficult tasks which the leaders of human thought and life face today—the task of synthesizing and

harmonising their separate urges. We must postulate that the advance of humanity is not unilinear but multilinear, not through fixed but fluctuating stages, not under one discipline but many.

Can we demarcate the various aspects of human life and allot their fields exclusively to particular methods of study and approach, or can we treat the whole human life as one and allocate it either to religion, morals or science only to be studied and valued by it, or shall its various aspects be studied separately by different sciences and philosophies and also jointly by them and aiming at the highest ends of humanity.

Science has today influenced greatly our social thinking and social living. It has also affected our moral and religious attitudes. Pure sciences have changed our processes of our social thinking, and applied sciences our methods of social living. Mathematical, physical and biological sciences have discredited our mythologies of creation and credologies of this worldly and other worldly life. They have led to the growth of new social or human sciences whose methodology is based on those of natural sciences No doubt, if we compare these sciences, the subdivisions of social sciences–sociology, anthropology, economics, politics, unlike those of natural sciences, seem largely, though not entirely, abstractions from reality, not sections of reality. In physicial and biological sciences, physics, chemistry, botany and zoology, the objects of study such as elements plants, animals seem real and independent objects and groups. They are not aspects of something complex. They are real things. The subjects of social sciences are mostly aspects of and abstrac tions from social reality. Their study depends on the contents of those aspects and their relation to the whole social reality, and not upon merely its subdivisions or factors mapped out for the purposes of study. The problem of natural sciences is the problem of observation and experiment and a search for laws of behaviour or action of the objects of study. The problem of social sciences is the problem of understanding and experiencing the course and relation of social life and a search for its values in time, place and objective

The natural scientist can stand outside his objects of observation. The social scientist must stand inside his subjects of study. Thus it is not possible to apply fully the methods of physical sciences to the study of man and society. But they give upto a certain stage great help in the study and analysis of human social processes and relations, mental attitudes and behaviours. In the natural sciences the aim is to bring certain qualities of as many objects as possible under the fewest possible generalisations In these generalisations the objects are not explained in their individuality but in their resemblances and relations which they bear to one another In humanistic studies where we deal with aspects of human life – individual and social – we are not dealing with general conceptions alone, but far more with values which are drawn from individual conceptions We deal with what is individual and unique, with values of the unique, and with the meaning of the unique.

The contribution of science to our civilisation is very great. Its attitude and methodology, its outlook and technology have been great factors in its growth. It is due to it that our social current is moving so rapidly, taking new forms and contents, and growing broader and deeper towards a new humanity.

Our new world is a world of science and invention, technology and engineering. Science belongs to and can be appropriated by the whole world. Its methods and discoveries, products and processes can be understood and applied by all. It gives the same results everywhere objectively. It does not require any God to be pleased or any prophet to be admired. It does not lay down any frontiers, physical, mental, moral or cultural, for deriving its benefits It primarily represents an attitude of mind a mood of approach, an experimental method, by which we discover and verify realities, organise ascertained facts in consistent groups, learn their structural relations, and ascertain their place in the larger scheme of knowledge.

Inspite of great advances in science we are living in a sick world today, a world of political anarchy and economic misery, social maladjustments and communal hatreds. We are all ailing and suffering from a number of evils. Our life and living are not happy and contented Can science help us in promoting our

security and welfare ? Can it alone do it ? Science can give us scientific means and methodology, scientific spirit and attitude. Its service in the past has been great. We have advanced from a donkey-house civilisation where all was stable and unchanging, neither free nor equal, to a new monkey-house civilisation where everything seems to be unstable, free and in conflict. But still it is a progress to better forms of life and higher standards of living. But what worries us is the instability and anarchy in our life. If Science can lead us to a plan-key house civilisation where both order and progress, equality and freedom, on human scale are harmonised, then it will have done its work well The human Caravan has no doubt passed through primitive stages of innocence and ignorance, and the medieval ages of blind faith and escapism, and has now reached the modern stage of science and its age of hope. Today in all arts of war and peace science reigns supreme. Science is not merely conserving our life and giving us minima of living, but is also helping us in achieving good life. Our problem is not only of mere physical existence and material welfare but also largely a problem of good life. Today our difficulties are those of choosing our moral aims and forming social relations. Unprecedented knowledge of Science and the power it has given over natural forces and human resources have created unprecedented conditions in human contact and relations. Unless there is a corresponding development in our moral attitude and mental approach, we cannot utilise the knowledge and power of science to cope with those conditions and to promote human security and welfare Science must not only assure us conditions of physical and material security-food, housing, clothing, health and hygiene, but also insure means for our mental and moral welfare, education and co-operation, peace and progress. The new kingdom or order which Science wants to build up must understand our material needs, take account of our resources and apply them for our physical security as well as social welfare

Our progress towards a higher standard of living depends on (1) our natural and human resources properly developed and applied, (2) our scientific inventions and technological applications, (3) our faith in the brotherhood of humanity as a whole,

in its unity and creativity, (4) our moral code of equality and freedom, and (5) our political system and economic advance. The fundamental facts of our world are its increasing population, its increasing want leading to unemployment and poverty in various areas, its social maladjustments and misappropriations, its increasing contacts, resulting in hatreds and crimes and its increasing fear and frustration, all these leading to an increase of human misunderstanding and hatreds, splits and conflicts. Our problems have therefore to be solved on three planes-material, moral and mental. History shows that Science, Ethics and Religion are the disciplines which are expected to suggest correct ways of doing this. No doubt fundamentally all social problems are interrelated, and all disciplines, scientific, moral and religious, are concerned with the choice of correct ways in a number of possibilities which are latent or open, or invented by man's mind. Science will become more important if it helps not only in the choice of means, but also that of ends which involve moral and mental judgments. Science primarily gives the means to control nature and to use it for human welfare. It assures the material foundations of our social well-being. It tries to solve the problem of our misery by providing means to cope with our wants

But can it also provide solutions for the choice or moral ends, the betterment of human relations, and for the development of a will to live or a faith in the future

Will Science satisfactorily answer, the questions of the good, the beautiful, the real as human quests, of human destiny and of man's rebirth, or life after death ? These questions have a spiritual value and require experience Can Science also take the place of philosophy, art and religion ? Science at present does not acknowledge that the affairs of men are subject to any divine or transcendental power, or to any blind, benign or malign fatalism. Science believes in finding out empirically correct knowledge of natural and human behaviour and adopting it for controlling nature and guiding man. Science is confident that it can solve welfare questions and remove social maladjustments, if men accept the social habits of altruism and work, and the moral attitude of equality and brotherhood, and give up proper-

tiering and profiteering ways and aims. But these social and moral qualities are indicated and affirmed by ethics and religion. Science cannot analyse or prove them by its own methods of study. Thus our attitude in relation to social problems must be an ethico-religio-scientific attitude. But science even then will give its methodology to other disciplines, its spirit of unbiassed examination of facts of human experience and behaviour, and its critical judgment

But all these disciplines with their different aims and approaches, fields and outlook should be harmonised and properly interrelated If they claim to be true by themselves and are rigid in their attitudes, then human problems will become difficult to be solved. Man acquires knowledge not only through reason, experiment and nature, but also through intuition, experience and history. His problem is not merely of action but also of valuation and will-power Science studies nature and tells us how to live with it. Morals study man and society and tells us how to live in it. Religion studies the creation of nature and the course of man, and gives us a will to live Each of them influences man's life as a whole But if each of them propounds rigid ways not in harmony with one another, then a fundamental conflict within social life will be created and none of them will solve satisfactorily human problems Therefore our problem is one of synthesis and harmony We have to render to each of them their due, but not to surrender to one at the cost of the other or of the whole. Science and technology give physical welfare Ethical valuation gives moral stability. Religious intuition gives faith in life and will to live Our postulate is that every detail of human life is extremely complicated It is connected with every other detail by innumerable threads of habit and custom and ideas of good and evil, and by economic interest and emotional feeling Hence all the disciplines which can guide and control them are necessary Science gives utilities for human welfare - such as health and hygiene, longevity and livelihood, leisure and recreation Morals promote qualities of human happiness such as liberty, equality, and fraternity; justice and toleration, truth and non-violence, chastity and greedlessness Religion creates a faith and will to live by expounding the reality in and behind life and universe

Though science does not contribute directly to the determination of values of life, it does great service by providing the conditions and laying down the foundation of a better world order and higher human values. In creating a better economic life and in assuring higher standards of living and leisure it makes the realisation of moral and religious values on a large scale possible

Thus we are living today in the republic of Science and technology which makes human cultural contacts more intimate, easy and expansive. It gives better environment, better means of livelihood, housing and clothing, better protection against natural calamities and diseases, better health and hygiene, better means of conveyance and communication. It widens the means of self-expression and education, and opportunities for service and vocation It increases our understanding of the world, tells us of different types of human societies and of the unity of mankind and of its continuity, diffusion and fusion in space, time and culture. It transcends the barriers of race, language, region and religion in its sweep in a search for knowledge. It gives a methodology of open approach to knowledge and throws open its doors to all those who seek its shelter and admission It does not build a mystic house or prison round its knowledge and ways of life. Thus the republic of science is the most advanced commonwealth of mind without any particular territory, without standing armies and without secret diplomacy. Yet it possesses the most powerful government in the world. Without science and scientists the modern civilisation will collapse

It has ushered in new ways of life and new means of living. It has increased production, developed communication, adjusted distribution and provided for consumption by its new mechanical inventions, technical appliances and engineering skill. It has affected our mental, moral and cultured outlook and trained our judgment for choice of right relations of life and correct ways of behaviour. It has given a new forward look and useful knowledge about many questions of our life. It has done away with the age of superstition. It has removed the peril of being subjugated by less civilised neighbours of being overwhelmed by

hordes of barbarian invaders It has introduced secularisation and rationalisation It has improved the life of common man. It has freed, educated and inspired mankind It has expanded the individual and his field of activity and contact, his understanding and knowledge by its inventions, new tools and mechanical processes.

In spite of the value of Science as the main foundation of modern civilisation, its scope is limited. It can analyse relations not reality, structure and not substance of life It can give pointer-readings but not life values. It can show natural sequences but cannot estimate social consequences Further the 20th century developments of Science have shaken its principle of causality and predictability. They do not claim any certainty, determinism or infallibility for their statements and conclusions All aspects of man's life and of natural phenomena are not as yet understandable, predictable and controllable They cannot be studied and understood merely as isolates and their totality is too complex to be clearly envisaged and fully analysed Consequently the truth and laws of science are also becoming provisional and relative.

As scientific methods cannot comprehend and explain values, such as goodness, freedom, and love, some scientists say there are no values, no goodness, no freedom, no love and so on. To them these things do not exist With them the object has devoured the subject. The man, the mind, the spirit, the morals have all withered away along with any transcendent God Therefore the conception and content of science, its explanations and conclusions should not be considered as rigid and final, but only relative and provisional Its mechanical aspect, its cause and effect relations should not be overemphasized. It must take account of moral and religious limitations of the people in using its power and making its application to promote their ends Science must become and remain an ally or handmaid in the task of achieving highest human values and not prostitute its power and skill for narrow and selfish group interests. It must promote political integration, social welfare and economic opportunity and cultural progress

We must however, avoid the danger of the power of science falling into the hands of monsters of men and nations who are not ministers of peoples, security and welfare. Otherwise a new barbarism more dangerous and disastrous to humanity than the old will develop and devour men and destroy the very foundations of human civilisation. Scientists must be able to control the forces they have let loose. Otherwise the new *Bhasmāsura* of science will destory the scientist and his creation, the new civilisation Science has out-stripped the advance of human morals The growth of its power is not accompanied by a corresponding growth in morals and culture of humanity There is a disharmony and want of balance between them. Our moral and cultural lag has allowed the power of Science being used by imperialists and capitalists for aggrandisement and exploitation of the disinherited peoples and workers of the world. Science must be accompanied by a high moral sense of duty and cultural discipline and responsibility. Uncontrolled science would be a great danger to humanity and its civilisation.

The social results of scientific development are very great. It has given us a conception of one world, one humanity, and a universal society, by developing rapid means of communication, transport and close contact, and by opening the doors of all countries and regions to all peoples It has developed a law of evolution and convergence of cultures. It has perfected a method of observation, experiment and study and has given a breadth of outlook, a tolerance of opinion, a sense of cooperation and a measure of detached judgment and impersonalness which are very valuable not only for acquiring knowledge but also for our moral living and for our will-to-live. It has enormously increased our control and use of natural forces and satisfied our increasing material needs It has set us on the path of assured material progress and mental achievement. It has minimised the sacredness of particular persons and the despotism of authority. It has changed values of life, if it has not been able to estimate values of life. It does not prepare any Procrustean bed of determinism for man's guidance like any religion or "ism" It does not make facts fit any preconceived theory of its own, because it has no preconceptions. Huxley said "Science commits suicide when it adopts a creed."

The results of scientific research are now being applied to practical affairs and are profoundly changing our civilisation and affecting human happiness.

Science makes possible the material welfare of man. Can it also make a contribution to the good life of man? Science tries primarily to find out the nature, the character and the direction of the evolutionary process in the world as a whole, and also to elucidate the causes of human actions and their consequences in relation to that direction. But there is nothing in the results of science today for us to believe that it can guarantee to us the absolute stability of even the most generel laws that it has stated. The central problem of good life seems to be difficult to be solved only by methods and direction given by natural and social sciences. They can throw light on the way in which the mind of man can apprehend values, but they cannot determine whether they are truly values and what the scale of moral values is If the develoment of moral values was to be determined wholly by external conditions, and they did not depend for their appreciation and choice on internal factors, then any true law of science-rational or dialectical - could give us a scheme and scale of good values of life: But as the environment influences life so also the inner ideas, feelings and attitudes greatly mould our life. If it is true to say that societies create ideas, it is even more true to say that ideas change societies. The theory of evolution seems to suggest that its course is towards some complex forms of life and that all moral ideas are primarily relative. But in that process *who* chooses some of these and rejects others unless it is the inner moral consciousness of man. Can the scientific study of the world process teach us what is good and what we ought to do. Science cannot say that it is moral or immoral. Its characterisation can only be a-moral. It cannot even predict and say it 'will' or 'must' happen. It can tell us only what has been, what is, and what will probably and not certainly be. It also cannot tell us that what has been, is, and will be right and good. We have to recognise the presence and force of inner factors which are inspiring and determining in the choice of values and ways of life. Our life can be really understood in terms of values, not merely in terms of its various stages and factors. These values constitute various types - such as the scientific, the moral, the religious, the aesthetic. Each one

of these types shows a particular structure of the human mind or quest. The man dedicates himself to one or more of these types. Therefore a time has now arrived for creating a closer union of the achievements of knowledge and the values of life. Science, morals, religion and art must give more help in the development of the deep and universal elements of our personality. All these branches of knowledge have at present developed a one-sided approach and atmosphere and hardly any attempt has been made to connect the whole knowledge and experience with actual values and intuitions of human life. The most disturbing fact of our time is that our knowledge of Science and especially its practical applications have far outrun our conceptions and practices of good life Science has now placed great means and instruments of world-shaking, world-shocking and world-shaping power in the hands of our political rulers and economic power-holders who abuse them for their own unrighteous purposes of subjection and exploitation. These means and tools are in themselves non-moral We need not blame the science, but the man who uses them or the scientist who prostitutes them Thus morality or the will to good lies in the man himself. It is due to his choice of wrong ends and misuse of good means that the will to evil or immorality arises It is not the province of science to tell us whether the means and ends adopted are good or bad morally.

Then, who are the real authors of any ethical change or choice? Certainly they are not found in the environmental change or mutation, but in the ethical choice and rise of men. It is a Buddha or a Christ, a Krishna or a Muhammad, a Tolstoy or a Gandhi who points the way to new levels of conduct and new standards of value, and it is by a conscious choice and struggle under his leadership that humanity accepts them. It cannot be admitted that the course or direction of evolution is inevitably good or right. We do not and cannot know that its goal is also good. One cannot trace in it any particular purpose which is continuously and necessarily good We cannot postulate any materialistic inexorable or moral determinism in it We cannot consider human mind as merely a mechanism of stimulus and response. It also holds within itself a set of urges or drives. Any one of them may be set in motion and come forward to change

the ethical or social current. Therefore the theory of evolution and its moving towards a right direction achieving good all along becomes a myth from the social point of view The theory of social Darwinism is now completely discredited and discarded. Science may tell us what to do to reach a desired end or to achieve a desirable purpose. But it cannot point out to us what end to desire. It cannot guide us in the choice of our purpose. Science is the expression of our will to know our environment (of the past) - its causation, course, connection and consequence It invents the means to know it and tools to use it for our physical existence and material welfare. Morals are the expression of will to good life (in the present) - its behaviour and relations. It lays down the principles of good conduct Religion is the expression of our will to live creative life (in the future) - its consciousness and continuity. It lays down its affirmations and prohibitions of spiritual life Art is the expression of our will to feel the eternal - its beauty and enjoyment It gives us its impressions and creations of the reality

But if we confuse the separate spheres and functions of these and surrender to any one discipline the whole province of human life and its aspirations, then we create a conflict of means and values in our study of man and environment We must study and express these aspects,- will-to-know, will-to-good, will-to-live, and will-to-feel, - separately and then correlate and synthesize their directions for the existence and welfare of man

In early times religion absorbed or dominated all aspects, and laid down rules for human behaviour from the point of view of its own approach. It became science, morals, art and religion, all in one. Then these aspects were separated But still each one of them claimed dominance for its own approach and methods of life Science now wants to reject all other approaches in order to absorb them in its universal approach and to lay down its own rules for the discipline and welfare of life. It wants to drive all others out of the field. In this unity of approach, either the subject devours the object, or the object devours the subject Science now wants to tell us not only about the means i. e. - how values or ends can be achieved, but also about the ends i. e. - how to

choose our values, and what values are valid. No doubt knowledge of ourselves and of our environment has in itself both a moral significance and a social consequence. It will however only help us in our choice of values and not in their final determination. Science gives survival means in a natural environment; ethics, moral values in a social environment, and religion, a spiritual faith in physical and social environment (man and nature). If their discoveries and disciplines are properly correlated and harmonised, we shall understand the field and position of each, and the part they play in the stability, security and well being of human society has a whole.

Thank you

HISTORICAL DATA IN DAṆDIN'S DAŚAKUMĀRACARITA

BY

V. V MIRASHI

Nearly forty years ago Mark Collins drew attention to the narrative in the eighth *Ucchvāsa* of the *Daśakumāracarita* which pointed to the existence of a large southern power ruling over Vidarbha, with no fewer than six feudatory kingdoms owing allegiance to it [1] Collins saw in this a reflex of the actual conditions existing in the days of Dandin himself and therefore investigated the matter for fixing the date of that Sanskrit author Since then there has been considerable progress in our knowledge of the ancient history of India in general and of the Deccan in particular, which makes it necessary that the problem should be rediscussed in the light of recent researches.

As is well known, the *Daśakumāracarita* describes the adventures of ten Kumāras who were followers of Rājavāhana, the son of the dethroned king Rājahamsa of Magadha. One of them was Viśruta whose adventures are narrated in the eighth and last *Ucchvāsa* of the original work of Dandin The story of that chapter may be summarised as follows—

'In the country of Vidarbha there ruled a king named Punyavarman who belonged to the ancient Bhoja race. He was a very just and righteous king who protected his subjects, chastised his foes and gave liberal patronage to learned men He was succeeded by his young son Anantavarman This prince, though intelligent and accomplished in all arts, neglected the science of politics. Vasuraksita, the old minister who had been highly respected by his father, counselled him again and again to apply himself to the study of *daṇḍanīti*, but Anantavarman, coming under the evil influence of his courtier Vihārabhadra, treated the advice with contempt, gave himself up to the enjoyment of pleasures and

[1] Mark Collins-*Geographical Data of the Raghuvaṁśa and Daśakumāracarita* (1907), p. 21.

indulged in all kinds of vices, neglecting the affairs of State. His subjects imitated him and led a vicious and dissolute life As a consequence, disorder and lawlessness became rampant in the kingdom. Finding this a suitable opportunity, Vasantabhānu, the king of the neighbouring Aśmaka country, sent his minister's son to the court of Vidarbha. The latter ingratiated himself with the king and egged him on in his dissolute life Ultimately, when the country was thoroughly disorganised, Vasantabhānu instigated the king of Vanavāsī to invade the kingdom of Vidarbha. Anantavarman then mobilised his forces and called his feudatories to his help. Among those who rallied under his banner were, besides Vasantabhānu of Aśmaka, Avantideva of Kuntala, Vīrasena of Murala, Ekavīra of Ṛṣīka, Kumāragupta of Konkana and Nāgapāla of Nāsikya Followed by these feudatories, Anantavarman marched against the king of Vanavāsī and encamped on the bank of the Varadā.[1] Vasantabhānu, however, secretly conspired with the king of Kuntala and caused disaffection among other feudatories also. They treacherously attacked Anantavarman in the rear while he was fighting with the invading forces of the king of Vanavāsī. The king of Vidarbha was killed in the fight. Vasantabhānu then contrived to cause dissension among the feudatories also. They fought among themselves for the spoils of the war and destroyed one another. He then appropriated the whole booty and giving some part of it to the king of Vanavāsi, induced him to return to his country and himself annexed the whole kingdom of Vidarbha.

In the meanwhile the old minister Vasurakṣita, who was true to his salt, safely escorted Vasundharā, the queen of Ananta

[1] The Bombay Sanskrit Series edition of the *Daśakumāracarita* (p 138) states that the army was encamped on the Narmadā which is evidently incorrect As shown below, Vanavāsi, the well-known capital of the Kadambas, was situated in the North Kanara District of the Bombay Presidency. The ruler of Vanavāsī could not have penetrated to the Narmadā, without overrunning the entire Vidarbha which he had not evidently done I therefore accept the reading *Varadā-rodhasi* (in place of *Narmadā-rodhasi*) given by an old Ms., which is evidently a mistake for *Varadā-rodhasi* 'on the bank of the Wardhā' (see Agashe's ed. p 138, n). Since this was written, my friend Mr. P K Gode informs me that the reading *Varadā-rodhasi* is actually given by an old Ms. of the work, dated V. S. 1816, now deposited in the Bhandarkar Institute.

varman and her two children Bhāskaravarman and Mañjuvādinī to the court of Mitravarman, the half-brother of Anantavarman who was ruling at Māhismatī. The latter, finding that his advances were rejected by the queen, suspected that she wanted her son to inherit the kingdom of Māhiṣmatī. He therefore desired to kill the young prince. The latter, however, escaped with the help of a trusted old servant and while roaming through a Vindhya forest chanced to meet Viśruta who turned out to be his relative. Viśruta then vowed that he would exterminate the king of Aśmaka and place Bhāskaravarman on his ancestral throne. He then disguised himself and Bhāskaravarman as Kāpālikas and repaired to Māhismatī. There he killed Pracaṇḍavarman, the brother of Caṇḍavarman, the king of Mālava, who had come there to marry Mañjuvādinī. Viśruta also contrived to cause Mitravarman's death by means of a poisonous garland. He then married Mañjuvādinī and looked after the affairs of State in the kingdom of Māhismatī on behalf of Bhāskaravarman'.

Dandin's narrative ends here abruptly. So we do not know whether Viśruta succeeded in fulfilling his vow by destroying Vasantabhānu and placing Bhāskarvarman on the throne of Vidarbha[1]

The narrative sketched above points to the existence of a large southern Empire. The Emperor belonged to the ancient lineage of Bhoja. He ruled directly over Vidarbha which comprised modern Berar, the Marāṭhī-speaking districts of the Central Provinces and the portion of the Nizam's State north of the Godāvarī. The kingdom of Anūpa, whose capital was Māhismatī was incorporated with that of Vidarbha and was ruled by the emperor's half-brother. Vidarbha had a number of feudatory kingdoms viz., Kuntala, Asmaka, Ṛṣika, Murala Nāsikya and Konkaṇa. Of these Kuntala comprised the upper valley of the Kṛṣṇā and included the modern Southern Marāṭha Country and Kanarese districts of the Bombay and Madras Presidencies. Its northern limit was probably the Godāvarī.[2] This seems to have been a powerful kingdom, for Vasantabhānu wanted

[1] The *Uttarapīṭhikā* which completes the story states that Viśruta succeeded in fulfilling his vow, but this work is very late

[2] *A. B. O. R. I.*, Vol. XXV, p. 40.

to enlist its ruler's suprort to his plot before he approached other feudatories. Aśmaka which figures very prominently in the story comprised, according to the *Suttanipāta*, the country along the bank of the Godāvarī. Ṛsīka which is mentioned together with Vidarbha, Aśmaka and Anūpa in the Epics and inscriptions, could have been none other than the modern district of Khandesh as shown by me elsewhere.[1] Aśmaka and Ṛsīka were thus contiguous countries and were separated from each other by the Ajantā or Sātmālā range Murala was perhaps the country watered by the Muralā which figures in the *Uttararāmacarita* as a tributary of the Godāvarī. Nāsikya was of course the country round Nasik in the Bombay Presidency. Konkana is the well-known name of the strip of land between the western sea and the Sahyādri mountain.

The Empire of Anantavarman therefore extended from the Narmadā in the north to the Tungabhadrā in the South and from the Arabian sea in the West to the Vaingangā in the East. Beyond the frontiers of this kingdom lay the powerful kingdom of Mālava in the North, that of Kosala (modern Chhattisgarh) in the East and of Vanavāsī (modern Banvāsi in North Kānara) in the South. Mālava and Kosala appear to have been friendly to Vidarbha, the latter was even matrimonially allied with it. Vanavāsī, however, seems to have been hostile.

Mark Collins showed that this state of things existed only in the sixth century A. D. under the rule of the Vākātakas When he wrote, the chronology of the Vākātakas was very uncertain. Owing to the mistaken identification of Devagupta mentioned in Vākātaka land-grants with the homonymous king who belonged to the dynasty of the Later Guptas,[2] the Vākātakas were believed to have flourished in the eighth century A. D It redounds to the credit of Collins that he did not subscribe to the prevalent view, but independently evaluated the evidence and showed that the Vākātakas flourished in the Gupta age – a conclusion which has since been incontrovertibly proved by the discovery of the Poona

[1] *Ibid*, Vol XXV, p 168.

[2] This identification was first proposed by Dr Fleet and was accepted by Dr Kielhorn Dr. Bühler, however dissented from it and placed the Vākāṭakas in the 5th century A. D.

plates of Prabhāvatīguptā; for they show that Devagupta was another name of Candragupta II. In some other respects, however, Collin's conclusions were erroneous, based as they were on insufficient data.[1] We shall therefore review the history of the age to see what particular period of the Vākāṭaka rule is reflected in Dandin's narrative.

We must remember at the outset that we must not expect to find the names of historical personages in this narrative. Like his predecessor Kālidāsa and his successors Rājaśekhara and Padmagupta,[2] Dandin has plainly changed the names of the characters who figure in the story. But in other respects his narrative may be expected to contain a reflex of the historical events.

Let us first take a brief survey of Vākātaka history. Towards the close of the third century A. D the Vākātakas had a fairly extensive empire in the Deccan Pravarasena I who was the real founder of Vākātaka power, is said to have performed four Aśvamedhas besides several other Srauta sacrifices. He had four sons among whom, according to the Purānas,[3] his extensive empire was divided after his death. The eldest branch held northern Vidarbha and ruled first from Nandivardhana near Rāmtek (ancient Rāmagiri) in the Nagpur District and afterwards from Pravarapura wich has not yet been identified, but which may be Paunar in the Wardhā District The second branch ruled over southern Vidarbha from Vatsagulma, modern Bāsim in the Akola District. The other two branches may have ruled to the south of

[1] For instance, Collins thought that the Vākātakas rose to power in circa A D 400 and flourished till A D 600 and that they were connected with the Western Ksatrapas who disappear from history towards the close of the 4th century A. D. He also identified Prthivīseṇa whose feudatory Vyāghradeva's inscription was found at Nachna, with the first Vākātaka prince of that name In all these respects his conclusions have been proved to be erroneous

[2] I have shown elsewhere that Kālidāsa's play *Mālavikāgnimitra* reflects the matrimonial alliance between the Guptas and the Vakātakas See my Marathi book, *Kālidāsa*, pp 144 f For the historical data in Rājaśekhara's *Viddhaśālabhañjikā* and Padmagupta's *Navasāhasāṅkacarita*, see my articles in the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, Vol XI, pp 361 ff and *Ind. Ant*, Vol LXII, pp 101 ff.

[3] See Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 50.

the Godāvarī, but their records have not yet been discovered. They seem to have been crushed out of existence by a Rāṣṭrakūṭa family which rose in Southern Mahārāṣṭra in the last quarter of the 4th century A. D.[1]

The eldest branch produced several kings the best known of whom is Pravarasena II, the daughter's son of Candragupta II-Vikramāditya and the reputed author of the Prakrit kāvya *Setubandha*. During the reign of Pṛthivīṣena II this branch extended its sway to the north of the Narmadā as some stone inscriptions of this king's feudatory Vyāghradeva, who is plainly identical with the Ucchakalpa king Vyāghra, have been found in the Jaso and Ajayagadh States in Central India.[2] This branch seems to have come to an end soon after Pṛthivīṣena II who is the last king known from inscriptions.

The Vatsagulma branch also produced some great kings whose names are known from an inscription in Cave XVI at Ajantā. The last of them known so far was Hariṣena (A. D. 475–500). He was a very powerful and ambitious ruler. He appears to have annexed Northern Vidarbha after the death of Pṛthivīṣena II and either raided or exacted tribute from the rulers of Kuntala, Avanti, Kalinga, Kosalā, Trikūṭa, Lāṭa and Āndhra.[3] It was during his reign that three of the most beautiful caves at Ajantā viz. caves XVI, XVII and XIX, as well as the Ghatotkaca cave at Gulwāḍā were excavated and decorated.

The description of Hariṣena's conquests in the Ajantā inscription shows that his empire extended beyond the Narmadā in the North and the Kiṣṇā in the South and from the Arabian sea in the West to the Bay of Bengal in the East. The Vākāṭaka power crumbled soon after Hariṣena, for no successor of his is known from inscriptions. The circumstances which caused the sudden downfall of such a powerful empire have not been recorded in

---

[1] See my article 'The Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānapura' in *A. B. O. R. I.*, Vol XXV, pp 36 ff

[2] Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p 233, *Ep Ind*, Vol XVII, pp 12 ff

[3] The names of these countries occur in a mutilated verse in ll. 14–15 in the inscription in Cave XVI at Ajantā, in connection with the description of the conquests of Hariṣeṇa.

history. The eighth chapter of the *Daśakumāracarita*, if properly interpreted, may throw welcome light on this question.[1]

The *Daśakumāracarita* names Puṇyavarman and his son Anantavarman as kings of Vidarbha and Mitravarman as the ruler of Māhiṣmatī. All these belonged to the ancient Bhoja race The ancient history of Vidarbha, known so far, discloses no such dynasty of Varman kings. The Vākāṭakas, who alone could have been meant here, had their names ending in *sena*. The names of the characters in the *Daśakumāracarita* are therefore purposely changed. Again, the Vākāṭakas nowhere in their records connect themselves with the ancient Bhoja race. The Cammaka plates[2] of the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II no doubt mention Bhojakatarājya as a territorial division of Vidarbha, from which Collins has inferred that the Vākāṭakas called themselves Bhojas and ruled from Bhojakata, but the inference does not appear to be justifiable It is not however unlikely that the Vākāṭakas who ruled over Vidarbha, the land of the Bhojas, may have been popularly supposed to be of the Bhoja race The commentator of the *Setubandha*, has recorded the tradition that Pravarasena, the author of that *Kāvya*, was, according to some, called Bhojadeva[3]

The *Daśakumāracarita* mentions several feudatories of Anantavarman and therefore of his father Puṇyavarman whom we have identified with Hariṣeṇa. Let us see if any of them are known from other sources to have acknowledged the supremacy of the king of Vidarbha.

1 Vasantabhānu of Aśmaka – Asmaka, as already stated, was the name of the country between the Sātmālā range and the Godāvarī river. In the recently discovered Pāṇḍaraṅgapallī plates it is mentioned together with Vidarbha as conquered by Mānāṅka of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty and may have been in subordinate

[1] Mark Collins thought that the political condition described in the *Daśakumāracarita* existed before the time of Hariṣeṇa, for Daṇḍin describes Kuntala as a feudatory kingdom, while in the Ajantā inscriptions it is said to have been conquered by Hariṣeṇa, which shows that it was independent See his *Geographical Data* etc., p. 46 The argument does not appear convincing.

[2] Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, pp 235 ff

[3] Cf. *Pravaraseno Bhojadeva iti kecit* in the com on v. 9.

alliance with the former No records of the ruling family have yet been discovered, but that Aśmaka was ruled as a separate country in the 6th century A D is shown by an inscription of that age in Cave XXVI at Ajantā which names two ministers of the rulers of Aśmaka.

2 Avantideva of Kuntala – I have shown elsewhere that contemporary with the Vākātakas there was a dynasty of the Rāstrakūṭas ruling over the country of Kuntala which comprised the upper valley of the Krsnā. Their capital was Mānapura, modern Mān on the Mān river in the Sātārā District, which was founded by Mānānka, the progenitor of the family. The country of Kuntala was conterminous with Vidarbha and therefore its rulers often came into conflict with the Vākātakas of Vatsagulma.[1] The inscription in Cave XVI at Ajantā records two victories of the Vākātakas over the kings of Kuntala, the first during the reign of Sarvasena and the second during that of Harisena.[2] The king of Kuntala must have been smarting under the defeat inflicted by Harisena and therefore must have welcomed the opportunity to throw off the Vākātaka yoke during the reign of Harisena's weak successor

3 Ekavīra of Ṛsīka – Ṛsīka, as stated above, was the ancient name of the modern Khandesh District As I have shown elsewhere[3] from some copper-plate grants discovered in Khandesh, there was a feudatory family ruling over this country in the fourth and fifth centuries A. D Its capital was Valkha which I have identified with Vāghlī near Chālisgaon A large, but sadly mutilated, inscription in cave XVII at Ajantā mentions a long line of twelve princes which, from their names, appears to have been connected with the family ruling at Vāghlī The last of these princes, being very much grieved by the death of his younger brother, caused the caves XVII and XIX to be excavated at Ajaṇtā 'while Harisena, the moon among princes, was ruling the earth.' The mention of the Vākātaka ruler clearly idicates that this ruler of Ṛsīka was his feudatory.

---

[1] See my article 'the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānapura,' *A. B O. R I.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 36 ff

[2] Mirashi, *Vākātaka Inscription in Cave XVI at Ajantā* (Hyderabad Archaeological Series, No 14), pp. 4 ff.

[3] *A. B. O R I*, Vol. XXV, pp 159f

4 Nāgapala of Nāsikya–This prince probably belonged to the royal family of the Traikūṭakas who are known from their inscriptions and coins to have held Northern Mahārāṣṭra and Southern Gujarat in the fifth century A D. The Traikūṭakas at first owned the supremacy of the Ābhīras whose era they use in their inscriptions, but later on they became independent, for one of them, Dahrasena, (*circa* A. D. 450–75) performed an Aśvamedha sacrifice. Harisena claims to have defeated the ruler of Trikūṭa who was probably Vyāghrasena, for a copper-plate grant of the latter is dated K 241 (A. D. 490) Trikūṭa, from which the royal family took its name, was the range of hills which bordered the Nāsik District on the west The recently discovered Añjaneri plates of Bhogaśakti mention *Pūrva-Trikūṭa-viṣaya* or Eastern Trikūṭa District[1] which shows plainly that there was a district named after the mountain which divided it into two parts.

5 Kumāragupta of Konkana—The early history of Konkana is still uncertain for want of contemporary inscriptions The country was occupied by the Sakas and Sātavāhanas in the early centuries of the Christian era, but who succeeded them is not yet definitely known In K 245 (A D. 494) Konkana was under the rule of the Traikūṭakas, for a copper-plate of that year which was discovered in the Stūpa at Kānheri mentions 'the increasingly victorious rule of the Traikūṭakas' Perhaps the ruler of Konkana, whoever he was, at first owed allegiance to the Traikūṭakas, but submitted to the Vākāṭakas when they vanquished the Traikūṭakas.

6 Vīrasena of Murala—As shown above, the country of Murala may have been situated not far from the bank of the Godāvarī, but we have no knowledge of any dynasty ruling there.

We have thus seen that all these feudatories were ruling either to the west or to the south of Vidarbha Harisena claims to have conquered the eastern kingdoms of Kalinga, Kosala and Āndhra also, but none of these are mentioned in the story probably because they did not join Vasantabhānu's conspiracy. Two of these were probably relatives of the Vākāṭaka king. The *Daśakumāracarita*

---

1 *Ep. Ind*, Vol. XXV, p. 232

states that Anantavarman's mother was the daughter of the king of Kosala i. e., Daksina Kosala or Chhattisgarh. That the ruler of Kosala had submitted to the Vākātakas is known also from the incomplete Bālāghāt plates of Prthivīsena II. The contemporary ruler probably belonged to the so-called dynasty of Sarabhapura [1] The Āndhra king who may have belonged to the Visnukundin family, was also matrimonially connected with the Vākātakas, for Madhavavarman I who laid the foundation of Visnukundin power, in the Āndhra country, married a Vākātaka princess who was probably a descendant of Harisena himself.

The *Daśakumāracarita* mentions, besides these feudatory states, the kingdoms of Māhismatī and Mālava in the North and that of Vanavāsī in the South. The country of Anūpa of which Māhismatī was the capital, comprised the territory corresponding to the Nemād district of the Central provinces Of this country too we have little information, but from two copper-plate grants discovered in the Barwāni and Gwalior States [2] we learn that a king named Subandhu was ruling at Māhismatī in the fifth century A D for one of the grants is dated in the (Kalacuri) year 167 (A D 416-17) He does not appear to have belonged to the Vākātaka family Afterwards the country may have been annexed to the Vākātaka dominion and placed under a member of the royal family

Candavarman of Mālava-This country was then ruled by a very powerful ruler who may have been Yaśodharman of Mandasore, the famous vanquisher of the Hūna king Mihirakula The Mandasore stone pillar inscription of this king states that his empire extended over a very wide country extending from the Himālayas and the Brahmaputrā in the North of the Arabian Sea and the Mahendra mountain in the South.

Bhānuvarman of Vanavāsī - Vanavāsī, also called Vaijayantī, (modern Banavāsi in the North Kanara District), was the capital

[1] I have shown elsewhere that the so called kings of Sarabhapura flourished in circa 500-530 A D, see *Ep Ind.* Vol XXVI, p 228.

[2] *Ep Ind*, Vol. XIX, pp 261ff and *An Rep* of the Archaeological Department, Gwalior State for 1928-29, p 15 The editor of the Barwāni plates refers this date to the Gupta era, but the general resemblance of this grant to those of the kings of Valkha (A B O. R. I, Vol XXV pp 162f.) leaves no doubt that like the latter it also is dated in the so-called Kalacuri Cedi era of A. D. 249-50

of the Kadambas. Kadamba chronology is still uncertain, but that there was a powerful kingdom of the Kadambas in the fifth and sixth centuries A. D. is undeniable The last king of the main line was Harivarman whose Sāngoli plates seem to have been issued either in A. D 526 or A. D 545. His father was Ravivarman who may have been identical with Bhānuvarman [1] mentioned in the *Daśakumāracarita*

The description in the *Daśakumāracarita* is thus corrobotated in all important details by what we know about the history of the Deccan in the beginning of the sixth century A. D. It clearly suggests that the central power in the Vākātaka Empire became weak and feudatories began to show signs of revolt during the reign of Harisena's weak successor who led a dissolute life. There were chaos and confusion everywhere in the Vākātaka kingdom which ultimately led to an invasion by the Kadambas of Vanavasī at the instigation of the ruler of Aśmaka Owing to the treacherous defection of some other feudatories the Vākātaka king suffered a disastrous defeat and was killed in the fight The Aśmaka king then annexed Vidarbha to his kingdom. As Dandin's narrative ends abruptly, we do not know whether Bhāskaravarman whom we have identified with Harisena's grandson, regained the ancestral throne with external help But even if he did, he oould not have kept it long. And this is what actually happened; for within about fifty years of Harisena's death, Vidarbha was occupied by the Kalacuris who had, in the meanwhile, established themselves at Māhismatī. Silver coins of Krsnarāja (*circa* A D 550-575), the founder of Kalacuri power, have been discovered in the Amraoti District of Berar and the Betul District of the Central Provinces From some other indications [2] also we can infer that Vidarbha was occupied by the Kalacuris during the time of Krsnarāja.

[1] There was actually a prince named Bhānuvarman of the Kadamba family at this time, but he was not the ruling king as required He was the brother of the then ruling king Ravivarman. See his Halsi grant dated in the 11th year of Ravivarman s reign. *Ind Ant.*, Vol. VI, p 28.

[2] As I have shown elsewhere (*A B O. R. I*, Vol. XXV, pp 43) the records of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas who later on established themselves at Acalapura (modern Ellichpur) in Berar, copy certain expressions from the description of Kṛṣṇarāja in the grants of the Kalacuris which plainly shows that Kṛṣṇarāja had occupied Vidarbha.

The foregoing discussion must have made it plain that Dandin's narrative faithfully reflects the actual political situation in the Deccan in the beginning of the sixth century A. D. Such detailed knowledge of the different kingdoms flourishing in that age clearly indicates that Dandin must have lived at a time when the events described by him happened or were at least well remembered

The date of Dandin has long been a matter of keen controversy Some have placed him in the sixth century A. D., others in the 9th and some others in the 11th century A. D.[1] As shown above, the political conditions described in the eighth *Ucchvāsa* of the *Daśakumāracarita*, obtained in Vidarbha only in the sixth century A. D In later centuries the centre of imperial power in the Deccan shifted successively to Māhismatī, Bādāmi, Mānyakheta, and Kalyāni but it was never in Vidarbha Some of the geographical names also went out of use in later times. One such instance is that of Ṛsīka. This country is named in the *Mahābhārata, Rāmāyana, Bṛhatsaṃhitā* as well as in the Nāsik cave inscription of Pulumāvi, but it is unknown to later works and inscriptions All these indications point to the conclusion that Dandin must have flourished not long after A. D 550

The recently discovered Sanskrit works *Avantisundarīkathā* and *Avantisundarīkathāsāra* contained some interesting information about the ancestry and personal history of Dandin, but both these works are unfortunately fragmentary The latter work, however, states that Dandin was the great-grandson of the Sanskrit poet Dāmodara who was patronised by the Gānga king Durvinīta and the Pallava ruler Simhavisnu. Dāmodara must therefore have lived in the last quarter of the sixth century A. D. His great-grandson Dandin can consequently be referred to the third quarter of the seventh century A. D It has been doubted whether the author of the *Avantisundarīkathā* was identical with Dandin who wrote the *Daśakumāracarita*, but it is conceded even by those who doubt this identity that the biographical details about Dandin given in the aforementioned works may be correct[2] Dandin thus may have flourished nearly a hundred years after the fall of the Vākātakas It is not therefore unlikely that he had fairly reliable information about the last period of Vākātaka rule in Vidarbha.

[1] See Agashe's introduction in his edition of the *Daśakumāracarita* (Bom. Sansk. Series), p xxxviii. [2] See *Ind. Hist Quart*. Vol. III, p 403.

THE NARASIṀHA-PURĀṆA

By

R. C. HAZRA

The present *Narasiṁha-purāṇa*, [1] which is also called *Nṛsiṁha-* (or *Nārasiṁha-*) *purāṇa*, is one of the oldest and most important of the extant Vaiṣṇava Upapurāṇas It begins with a salutation to Narasiṁha and states that once, in the month of Māgha, some Veda-knowing sages came with their disciples to Prayāga from different parts of India (viz, Himālaya, Naimiṣāraṇya, Arbudāraṇya, Puṣkarāraṇya, Mahendra mountain, Vindhya mountain, Dharmāraṇya, Daṇḍakāraṇya, Śrīśaila, Kurukṣetra, Kaumāra-parvata, Pampā, etc), had their bath in the holy Ganges, and saw Bharadvāja in his hermitage When, after mutual greetings, they were engaged in 'talks about Kṛṣṇa' (kṛṣṇāśritāḥ kathāḥ), there arrived a Sūta named Lomaharṣaṇa, who was a disciple of Vyāsa and was versed in the Purāṇas (purāṇajña) After Lomaharṣaṇa had been duly received by the sages, Bharadvāja thanked him for having narrated to them the 'Saṁhitā named Vārāha' (i. e the *Varāha-purāṇa*) during the great sacrifice instituted by Śaunaka, and then, wishing to hear from him the 'Paurāṇa-saṁhitā named Nārasiṁha', put to him the following questions for detailed treatment

(1) Whence did this universe, with its moving and stationary objects, originate ? Who preserves it ? And where will it go after dissolution ?

(2) What is the extent of the earth ?

(3) What acts please Narasiṁha ?

(4) How does creation begin, and how does it end ?

(5) What are the four Yugas ? How are these to be reckoned, and what are their characteristics ?

(6) What will be the condition of people during the Kali age ?

[1] See Appendix I, pp 65-76

(7) How is Narasimha to be worshipped, and what places, mountains and rivers are sacred to him?

(8) How were the gods, Manus, Vidyādharas etc first created?

(9) Which kings were sacrificers, and who attained the highest success?

The Sūta consented to narrate the '*Nārasimhaka Purāna*.' Consequently, he saluted his teacher Vyāsa, through whose favour he learnt the 'Purānas', and then began to deal with the five Purāna topics (viz., Primary Creation, Secondary Creation, etc) by way of answering all the questions with the narration of various relevant stories. So, the present *Narasimha-p.* deals with the following topics —

Glorification of Narasimha (also called Visnu, Hari, Vāsudeva, Krsna, etc.) by identifying him with Nārāyana, the eternal Brahma Description of the origin of the cosmic egg (anda) from Brahma (i e. Nārāyana) according to the Sāmkhya system, Visnu's presence as Brahmā in this egg for creation Division of time into nimesa, kāsṭhā, kalā, muhūrta, ahorātra (day-and-night), paksa (fortnight), māsa (month), ayana, varsa (year), yuga and kalpa; and the measurement of those divisions with respect to men, Pitrs, Manus, Brahmā etc. Brahmā's origin from the lotus in Visnu's navel, origin of Rudra from Brahmā's rage, Brahmā's creation of Daksa and his wife, from whom Svāyambhuva Manu was born - (chaps 1-3). Origin of the ten sages Marīci, Atri, Angiras etc. from Brahmā's mind; Brahmā's creation of Śatarūpā who was given in marriage to Manu; creation by the sages except Nārada who was given to Nivrtti-dharma; creation by Rudra, creation by Daksa; the descendants of Daksa's daughters. - (chaps 4 5). Description of the Samsāra-vrksa (tree of rebirths) which causes delusion of the mind; praise of Jñāna, Visnu-worship and meditation on Visnu-Brahma as the means of getting rid of all sufferings brought on by rebirths; method and praise of muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra 'om namo nārāyanāya' for the purpose. - (chaps 16-18). Enumeration of Āditya's 108 names (including Śambhu, Tvaṣṭr, Kapila, Mrtyu, Hari, Hamsa, Pratardana, Taraṇi, Mahendra, Varuna, Visnu, Agni etc.) as mentioned by Viśvakarman (chap. 20). 'Short' genealogical

lists of the kings of the solar and the lunar race, the former ending with Budha, (v. l. Buddha in the Dacca University Mss Nos. 2713 and 2844), son of Śuddhodana, and the latter with Kṣemaka, son of Naravāhana and grandson of Udayana and Vāsavadattā (chaps. 22-23) Accounts of the past, present and future Manus and Manvantaras (chap. 24). History of the prominent kings of the solar and the lunar race (vamśānu-carita), especially of those who worshipped Narasimha and performed sacrifices (chaps. 25-29) Geography of the earth (chap. 30). Glorification of the performance of duties towards parents and husband (chap. 14). Glorification of Brahmans and of service rendered to them (chap. 28). Results of giving various articles (chap 30). Method of the worship of Gaṇeśa (chap. 26) Glorification of Narasimha-worship as well as of the different kinds of service rendered to Narasimha and his temple (viz, construction and sweeping of the temple and besmearing it with cow-dung; bathing of the image with pure water, milk, curd, honey etc or with Mantra, offer of various articles, recitation of hymns of praise; presentation of flags marked with the figure of Garuda, songs, musical concerts, or theatrical performances etc. held for Narasimha's pleasure; removal of flowers etc. with which Narasimha has been worshipped, and so on. - (chaps. 32-34). Sins arising out of crossing the flowers etc with which Visnu has been worshipped (chap. 28). The methods of performing Laksa-homa and Koti-homa for the good of the village or the town or the country in which these are performed (chaps. 34-35). The method of consecration of the images of Visnu (chap. 56). The Vedic and the popular (sarva-hita) method of Narasimha-(or Visnu-) worship (chaps 62-63). Description of the evils of the Kali age (chap 54). Duties of the four castes and orders of life (varnāsrama-dharma. - chaps. 57-60). Description and praise of Yoga which is to be practised by one who belongs to the fourth order of life (chap 61). Enumeration and praise of rivers and holy places sacred to Viṣṇu (chaps. 65-66). Praise of certain qualities of the mind (chap. 67). Mention and praise of a few Vratas (viz., Eka-bhakta, Nakta, Saura-nakta, Agastyārgha-dāna, etc. - chap. 67), Praise of the *Narasimha-purāṇa* (chap. 68),

In connection with these topics the following stories have been introduced in this Purāna, viz

the story of the birth of Vasistha and Agastya from Mitra and Varuna when the latter saw Urvaśī in a lake called Paundarīka in a forest in Kuruksetra (chap 6): the story of Mārkandeya who, being destined to die at the age of 12, worshipped Visnu, according to Bhrgu's advice, with the twelve-syllabled Mantra (om namo bhagavate Vāsudevāya) at Bhadravata on the bank of the river Tunga-bhadrā, with the result that even Death had no influence on him, and when Death and his assistants went to Yama to report how, in their attempt to bring Mārkandeya to the abode of Yama, they had been beaten back by the Visnu-dūtas, Yama reproached them for their conduct towards the Visnu-dūtas and praised Visnu (also called Vāsudeva and Krsna) as the chastiser even of himself (chaps 7-12), the story of Yama, who, though repeatedly tempted by his passionate sister Yamī to incest, did not agree to her proposal and was thus able to attain divinity (chap. 13); the story of a Brahmacārin named Deva-śarman who turned a wandering mendicant after his father's death, began to live at Nandigrāma in Madhyadeśa after visiting numerous holy places, became proud of his occult power by being able to reduce to ashes, by an angry look, a crow and a crane which were carrying away his rag, chanced to meet Sāvitrī, the devoted, and consequently omniscient, wife of a pious and learned Brahman named Kasyapa, and was reproached by her for his pride as well as for his neglect of duties to his mother and forefathers (chap. 14), the story of a learned Brahman, who, after his wife's death, visited numerous holy places, turned a Yati at the advice of Narasimha (who warned him that one, who does not belong to any order of life, is not favoured by him), and attained salvation after death (chap 15) the stories of the birth of the Aśvins and the Maruts, said to have been summarised from those told respectively by Vāyu and by Śakti-putra[1] (i. e. Parāśara)

[1] The printed ed. reads 'sakti-putrena' (see *Nar.* 19, 5), but the Dacca University Mss Nos 2713 (fol. 27a) and 284A (fol. 34b) read 'śaktriputrena'. In the Dacca University Ms No 323, the folios (37-40) containing chaps. 19-27 and verses 1-16 of chap. 28 of the printed ed. are lost.

in the 'Vaisnavākhya Purāna' (chaps. 19-21), the story of Iksvāku, who, considering renunciation to be the best way of Visnu-worship, went to the hermitage of Gālava and others after eulogising and worshipping Ganesa according to Vasistha's instructions, practised severe penance there, and muttered the twelve-syllabled Mantra 'om namo bhagavate vāsudevāya', with the result that Brahmā revealed himself before king Iksvāku, told him how, being directed by a voice from the air, he himself could experience Visnu by worshipping this god as well as by performing his own duties, and gave instructions to Iksvāku, who accordingly returned to his capital, did his duties as a householder, worshipped the images of Ananta and Mādhava given to him by Brahmā, and attained the region of Visnu (chaps. 25-26), the story of Śāntanu who, though worshipping Narasimha according to the method learnt from Nārada, once passed over Narasimha-nirmālya (i e the flowers etc with which Narasimha was worshipped) and was thus disabled from mounting his divine chariot but who regained his power by clearing the remnants of food of Brahmans for twelve years in Kuruksetra (chap 28), the story of Indra's son who used to steal flowers from the garden of a florist named Ravi and was disabled from mounting his chariot in consequence of passing over Visnu-nirmālya, placed by the florist near the garden according to Narasimha's instructions, but who got rid of his disability and went to his heavenly residence after clearing the remnants of food of Brahmans for twelve years in Kuruksetra (chap 28), the story of Dhruva's attainment of high position among the stars and planets through Narasimha's favour attained by means of Visnu-worship as well as by muttering the twelve-syllabled Mantra 'om namo bhagavate vāsudevāya' (chap 31), the story of the demons Sthūlasiras and Bahuroman, who disguised themselves as ascetics on the bank of the Revā with a view to carrying away Draupadī, and of whom the former was killed by Bhīma and the latter, when chased by Arjuna, took the form of a four-armed and yellow-robed being with a conch-shell, disc etc. in his hands and narrated to Arjuna how in his previous birth as a Brahman of ill repute he swept the floor of a Visnu-temple and lighted a lamp there for enjoying

the wife of a Brahman, how being beaten to death by the city-guards he attained heaven and remained there for a long time, how he was reborn as king Jayadhvaja of the lunar race and rendered service to the Visnu-temple, and how after death he enjoyed various pleasures in the regions of Indra and Rudra and was, on his way to the Brahmaloka, cursed by Nārada to become a demon (chap. 33) the stories of the ten incarnations of Visnu (viz., Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Narasimha Vāmana, Paraśurāma, Rāma, Balabhadra, Krsna, and Kalki) including the story of Prahlāda (chaps 36-54). the story of Śukra's regaining his eye which was pierced by Vāmana (chap 55); the story of Indra, who muttered the eight-syllabled Mantra and got rid of his female form that was brought on him by the curse of the sage Tinabindu for killing in his hermitage the demoness Dirghajanghā who, under the guise of an extremely beautiful woman, acted as a spy to Kuvera whose wife Citrasenā was stolen by Indra (chap. 63), the story of a Brahman named Pundarīka, who became a wandering mendicant without entering the second stage of life, settled at Sāligrāma and became an attendant (pārsada) of Nārāyana by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra (om namo nārāyanāya) and meditating on the deity according to the instructions of Nārada who introduced himself as a servant of Vāsudeva (chap 64)

From the above mentioned contents of the present *Narasimha p.* it is clear that this Purāna is meant exclusively for the glorification of Narasimha who is identified with Nārāyana (or Visnu) as one of the forms (mūrti) of the latter [1] and is thus called not only Nārāyana but also Visnu, Vāsudeva, Hari, Mādhava, Ananta, Krsna,[2] Dāmodara etc So Narasimha, though a form of Nārāyana or Visnu, is himself the principal god also It is this supreme deity called Nārāyana (or Visnu or Narasimha) who takes the form of Brahmā and Rudra for the sake of creation and destruction respectively, and for the work of preservation he takes the forms of (the inferior) Visnu, Narasimha etc [3] In creation he takes to Māyā [4] Though in this

[1] *Nar* 1, 30, 1, 64-65
[2] *Nar* 1, 10, 7, 37
[3] *Nar.* 1, 30, 2, 1, 1, 61-62 and 64-65, 39, 17b-18b.
[4] *Nar.* 3, 28—māyām adhiṣṭhāya sṛjaty anantaḥ.

Purāna Visnu (or Nārāyana) is described as four-armed, yellow-robed, having a complexion like that of the cloud, and holding a conch-shell, a disc, a mace and a lotus in his hands, he is called nirvikalpa, nisprapañca, advaita, sarvātmaka, ātma-caitanya-rūpa, jyotih-svarūpa, avyakta-svarūpa, ānanda-rūpa, cidātmaka etc.[1] and identified with the Brahma of Vedānta and the Purusa of Sāmkhya [2]

It has already been said that the present *Narasimha-p* is one of the oldest of the extant Vaisnava Upapurānas. It was translated into Telugu about 1300 A D [3] and is profusely drawn upon by the commentators and Nibandha-writers both early and late For instance, Gadādhara quotes verses from chap 58 in his *Kālasāra*, Gopālabhatta from chaps. 8, 9, 18, 28, 32, 33, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss.), 58 and 66 in his *Haribhakti-vilāsa*, Anantabhatta from chaps 34 and 35 in his *Vidhāna-pārijāta* I. Narasimha Vājapeyin from chaps 7, 8, 28, 33, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss), 58 and 63 in his *Nityācāra-pradīpa*; Raghunandana from chap 62 in his *Durgā-pūjā-tattva* and from chaps 8, 18, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss.), 58, 62, 63, 66 and 67 in his *Smrti-tattva*, Govindānanda from chaps 30, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss.), 58, 62 and 67 in his *Varsa-kaumudi*, from chap 58 in his *Śuddhi-kaumudi* and *Śrāddha-kaumudī*, and from chap 30 in his *Dāna-kaumudī*, Srīnāthacārya-cūdāmani from chap 58 in his *Krtya-tattvārnava*, Vidyākara Vājapeyin from chaps. 8, 15, 32, 58 and 63 in his *Nityācāra-paddhati*, Sūlapāni from chap. 58 in his *Dīpa-kalikā*, Vācaspati-misra from chap 65 in his *Tīrtha-cintāmani*; Mādhavācārya from chaps. 58 and 60 in his commentary on the *Parāsara-smrti*, Śrīdatta Upādhyāya from chaps 28, 32 and 58 in his *Krtyācāra* Madanapāla from chaps 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss) and 58 in his *Madana-pārijāta*; Hemādri from chaps. 26, 30, 58 and 67 in his *Caturvarga-cintāmani* · Vallālasena from chaps. 30, 34 and 58 in his *Dānasāgara*,

[1] *Nar* 17, 17-18, 21-25 and 27, 1, 61b-62a, 1, 31a; 53, 11, and so on.

[2] *Nar* 1, 31a and 36-39, 3, 13, 17, 35a

[3] Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, p 249.

Devana-bhaṭṭa from chaps 30, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss) and 58 in his *Smṛti-candrikā*, and Aparārka from chaps 58, 60 and 63 in his commentary on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* (see Appendix III). In his *Smṛti-tattva* II, pp. 84 and 284 Raghunandana quotes *Nar* 66, 45 and *Nar*. 30, 29-30a not direct from the *Narasiṁha-p* but from the '*Tīrtha-kāṇḍa-kalpataru*' and '*Dāna-ratnākara*' respectively. Though Vallālasena is very particular about the authenticity of the Purāṇas which he draws upon in his *Dānasāgara*,[1] he utilises the present *Narasiṁha-p.* without the least shade of doubt as regards its authenticity, antiquity and non-Tantric character. Moreover in 1030 A. D. Alberūnī mentions the *Narasiṁha-p.* in his first list of eighteen

[1] Interesting information about the Purāṇas is supplied by Vallālasena when, in his *Dānasāgara*, he refers to the contents of a few Purāṇic works by way of explaining why he rejected them partly or wholly. Regarding the *Ādi-purāṇa* he says that though it was well-known for its treatment of gifts divided according to the division of the year, it was slightly touched upon in the *Dānasāgara*, because its contents were already fully utilised in the *Ācāra-sāgara*, the *Bhāgavata*, the *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Nāradīya-purāṇa* did not contain any chapter on gifts and were consequently set aside the *Liṅga-purāṇa*, whose volume was expanded by the chapters on big donations (mahādāna) contained in the *Matsya-purāṇa* and which was thus no better than a digest on gifts, was not drawn upon, because the substance of its contents was already obtained from other Purāṇas, the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* was utilised upto the chapters dealing with saptamī (-kalpa), while those on the aṣṭamī- and navamī (-kalpa) were rejected on account of their imbibing Tantric influence, the *Viṣṇu-rahasya* and the *Śiva-rahasya*, which were famous among the people, were mere compilations and were consequently not utilised, and though the *Bhaviṣyottara* was famous for its customary laws (or was popularly followed) and did not contradict good customs, it was avoided in the *Dānasāgara* for want of sufficient evidence to prove its authenticity.

Next Vallālasena names a set of Purāṇas rejected by him as spurious, viz, *Tārkṣya* (i e. *Garuḍa*), *Brahma*, *Āgneya*, *Vaiṣṇava* consisting of 23000 ślokas, and *Liṅga* of 6000 ślokas, and in connection with their contents he says that these works dealing with initiation, consecration, ways of salvation for the Tantriks, testing of gems, fictitious genealogies, lexicography, grammar etc. and containing irrelevant and contradictory statements, were used as means of deception by Mīna-ketanas (followers of Mīnanātha ?) and others, who were hypocrites, heretics and pseudo-ascetics. By his remark that due to its wide circulation the *Skanda-purāṇa* existed in more parts than one, and that three of its parts dealt with the accounts (kathā) of Pauṇḍra, Revā and Avanti, Vallālasena seems to include those three parts among the spurious Purāṇas. See *Dānasāgara*, fol. 3b-4a.

'Purāṇas' which was dictated to him.[1] These show that by the end of the tenth century A. D. the *Narasiṁha-p.* attained such prominence that its authenticity as an ancient 'Purāṇa' was not at all questioned. Hence this Purāṇa must have been written not later than 800 A. D.

The mention of a 'Vārāhākhyā Saṁhitā' or 'Vārāha'[2] in the *Narasiṁha-p* must not be taken to point to the extant *Varāha-p* and thus be used as an evidence for the late date of the present *Narasiṁha.* In *Nar* 1, 14-15 Bharadvāja says, "O Sūta, the Saṁhitā named Vārāha has already been heard from you by these (sages) and ourselves during the great sacrifice of Śaunaka; at present these sages and myself want to hear from you the Paurāṇa-saṁhitā named Nārasiṁha"[3]; and in *Nar* 31, 10b-11a Sūta says in connexion with geography, "The region of Viṣṇu is situated at a distance double in comparison with that of the region of Brahmā; its glories have been described in the Vārāha by those who think over the (different) regions"[4] From these it is clear that the *Narasiṁha-p* speaks of a *Varāha-p* which was narrated by Sūta to the sages Bharadvāja and others during the great sacrifice of Śaunaka and which dealt, among other topics, with the praise of the region of Visnu But in the present *Varāha-p* there is no mention of Śaunaka's great sacrifice as the occasion of the narration of the Purāna or of Bharadvāja as one of the interlocutors, nor does this Purāna deal

---

[1] Sachau, *Alberūnī's India*, Vol I, p. 30.

This list consists of the following 'Purāṇas' *Ādi-p*, *Matsya-p*, *Kūrma-p*, *Varāha-p*, *Narasiṁha-p*, *Vāmana-p*, *Vāyu-p.*, *Nanda-p.*, *Skanda-p.*, *Āditya-p.*, *Soma-p*, *Sāmba-p*, *Brahmāṇḍa-p*, *Mārkaṇḍeya-p*, *Tārkṣya-p.*, *Viṣṇu-p*, *Brahma-p* and *Bhaviṣya-p.*

[2] In *Nar* 31, 11a the printed ed. reads 'varāhō', but the Dacca University Mss read 'vārāhe' in the corresponding line See footnote 4 below.

[3] bharadvāja uvāca ।
śaunakasya mahāsatre vārāhākhyā tu saṁhitā ।
tvattah śrutā purā sūta etair asmābhir eva ca ॥
sāṁpratam nārasiṁhākhyāṁ tvattah paurāṇa-saṁhitām ।
śrotum icchāmy ahaṁ sūta śrotukāmā ime sthitāh ॥ *Nar.* 1, 14-15

[4] brāhma-lokād viṣṇu-loko dviguṇe ca vyavasthitah ।
varāhe tasya māhātmyaṁ kathitaṁ loka-cintakaih ॥ *Nar.* 31, 10b-11a.

The Dacca University Mss Nos 2713 (fol 41b), 323 (fol. 47a) and 284A (fol. 54a) read 'vārāhe' for 'varāhe'. The former two Mss read 'yoga-cintakaiḥ' for 'loka-cintakaiḥ'.

with the glories of the Visnu-loka. So, the *Varāha-p.* mentioned in the *Narasimha-p.* must have been different from the extant *Varāha*, which was thus unknown to the present *Narasimha-p.* The original chapters of the extant *Varāha-p* being written about 800 A. D., the date of the present *Narasimha-p* must be placed earlier.

The verses common to the *Narasimha-p.* and the present *Varāha* in their chapters on primary and secondary creation [1] need not be taken to prove the indebtedness of one of these two Purānas to the other These common verses must have been taken by these two Purānas from the earlier *Varāha-p.* which is now extinct.

In chaps. 26, 33 (verses 1-14), 34, 35, 56, 62 and 63 (verses 1-9 and 199-222) the *Narasimha-p.* gives the method of Ganeśa-worship, the Vedic and popular methods of Visnu-worship, the method of consecrating the images of Visnu, and the procedure to be followed in the performance of Laksa-homa and Koti-homa. But neither in these chapters nor anywhere else in the whole Purāna there is the slightest trace of Tantric influence This Purāna does not mention the Tantiiks or the Tantras even for the sake of denouncement So, it is evident that this Purāna was composed at a time when the Tantras did not begin to influence the people very seriously Now, from an examination of the Mahāpurānas we have seen that Tantric influence began to be imbibed by the Purānic works from about 800 A. D [2] Hence the *Narasimha-p.* must be dated not later than 700 A D.

Though in chap. 36 of the *Narasimha-p.* Mārkandeya promises to narrate the stories on the following (eleven) incarnations of Visnu, viz, Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Narasimha, Vāmana,

[1]

Narasimha-p	*Varāha-p* (ASB ed)	*Narasimha-p*	*Varāha-p* (ASB ed.)
1, 17, 19-20a and 23a	= 1, 12-15a	3, 10b	= 2, 21a
1, 32-33	= 2, 3-4	3, 11-28b	= 2, 23-41a
1, 35-36a	= 2, 5-6	4, 1-6	= 2, 42-47
3, 1-9a	= 2, 13-20	5, 5a and 6b-8a	= 2, 49-50

[2] See Hazra, *Purānic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, p 260.

Paraśurāma, Rāma,[1] Balarāma, Krsna, Buddha and Kalki, he gives, in chaps. 37–54, the stories on all these except the Buddha and adds at the end, " I have spoken on the ten incarnations of (Visnu) the destroyer of (all) earthly sins The devotee of Nrsimha, who always listens to these, attains Visnu " (*Nar*. 54, 6). So the only line ' kalau prāpte yathā buddho bhaven nārāyaṇah prabhuh ' (*Nar*. 36, 9a), which mentions the Buddha incarnation, is undoubtedly spurious This line does not occur in the Dacca University Mss (Nos. 2713, 323 and 284A) of the *Narasimha-p* Thus the *Narasimha-p* knows the group of the ' ten ' incarnations of Visnu but is quite ignorant of the Buddha incarnation An examination of the different lists of incarnations of Visnu shows that the Buddha began to be regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu from about 550 A. D[2] Hence the date of the *Narasimha-p*. is to be placed not later than about 550 A D

According to the *Narasimha-p* Kisna embodies only a part of Visnu's Śakti [3] It is for this inferior position of Krsna that Yama says in *Nar*. 9, 3, " I submit to the slayer of (the demon) Madhu , even Kisna is not able to restrain me of his own accord." Hence the *Narasimha-p* is to be dated earlier than the present *Bhāgavata*, in which Krsna is given a higher position and is even called the Bhagavat himself [4] As the prosent *Bhāgavata* is to be dated in sixth century A D [5] the *Narasimha-p* is to be placed not later than 500 A. D.

[1] In the present ed the verse (no 7) on theRāma incarnation is placed before the line (no. 9a) on Paraśurāma, but in the Dacca University Mss (Nos 2713, 323 and 284A) this order has been reversed.

[2] See Hazra, *Purānic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs* pp 41–42.

[3] See *Nar* 53, 30b–31a (avatīrya mahītale sita-kṛṣṇe ca macchakti kamsādīn ghātayiṣyatah), 33a (presayāmāsa te śaktī sita-krsne svake nṛpa) and 66a (ittham hi śaktī sita-kisna rūpe harer anantasya mahābalāḍhye)

[4] Cf *Bhāgavata-p* 1, 3, 38a–ete cāmsa-kalāh pumsah krsnas tu bhagavan svayam.

[5] As there are a few parallelisms in idea as well as language between the works of Samkarācārya and the present *Bhāgavata p*, some scholars are inclined to date the *Bhāgavata* after that great Vedāntist scholar (See *Bhāratīya Vidyā, II, pp 129–139*) But these scholars overlook the facts that the present *Bhāgavata*, like the other Purānic works, has been revised and emended on more occasions than one, and that Samkarācārya's influence must be due to these revisions and emendations On the other hand, there are evidences to prove the pre-Śamkara origin of earlier portions of the present *Bhāgavata*. (See Hazra, *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, pp. 52–57).

Thus we get the lower limit of the date of this Purāṇa.

Again, in *Narasiṁha-p.*, chaps. 47–52, a summary of the contents of the *Rāmāyana* is given in connection with the Rāma incarnation of Viṣṇu, *Nar.* 29, 3 mentions some of the notable incidents of the *Mahābhārata*, viz, Arjuna's receipt of the Pāśupata weapon from Śaṁkara and the assistance given by him to Agni in consuming the Khāṇḍava forest, the Pāṇḍavas' residence *incognito* with Draupadī in Virāṭa's capital, and so on; and in *Nar.* 29, 6 Janamejaya is said to have heard the entire *Mahābhārata* from Vaiśampāyana a student of Vyāsa, in order to get rid of the sin arising out of killing a Brahman (brahma-hatyā)." Thus the *Narasiṁha-p* knows both the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata*. In *Nar* 19, 5–6 Sūta says to Bharadvāja, " O high-minded one, the origin of the Maruts has already been described elaborately by the son of Śaktri (i e. by Parāśara) in the Purāṇa named Vaiṣṇava, and the creation of the twin gods Aśvins has been narrated in minute details by Vāyu. I shall speak to you briefly on this creation. Listen to me." [1] Thus the *Narasiṁha-p* mentions two Purāṇas, of which the second is decidedly the present *Vāyu-p.*, which contains the story of the birth of the Aśvins in chap. 84 and is declared by Vāyu. [2] but the information regarding the 'Vaiṣṇavākhya Purāṇa' in which Śaktri's son (Parāśara) was the narrator of the story of the birth of the Maruts, does not tally fully with the present *Viṣṇu-p.* which, though narrated by Parāśara, does not contain this story But this absence of the story of the birth of the Maruts in the present text of the *Viṣṇu-p.* must not be taken very seriously, because it can be explained away by saying that

[1] sūta uvāca ||
marutāṁ vistareṇoktā vaiṣṇavākhye mahāmate |
purāṇe śakti-putreṇa purotpattiś ca vāyunā ||
aśvinor devayoś caiva sṛṣṭir uktā suvistarāt |
saṁkṣepāt tava vakṣyāmi sṛṣṭiṁ etāṁ śṛṇuṣva me || *Nar.* 19, 5–6.

The Dacca University Mss Nos. 2714 and 284A read 'śaktri-putreṇa' for 'śakti-putreṇa'. Dacca University Ms. No 323 has lost chaps. 19–27 and verses 1–16 of chap 28.

[2] This identity seems to be supported by the verses common to the *Vāyu* and the *Narasiṁha-p.*, viz,

Vāyu-p. 6, 60–65 cf. *Nar.* 3, 23–28a,
" 9, 75ff. . cf " 5, 3ff.

the particular Ms or recension of the present *Viṣṇu-p.* which was used by the *Narasiṁha-p* contained the above mentioned story, and also because there are verses common to the *Narasiṁha* and the *Viṣṇu-p* [1] Hence the *Narasiṁha-p* must be dated later than the present *Vāyu-p* and *Viṣṇu-p.* That the *Narasiṁha-p* was composed later than the *Viṣṇu-p* is shown by another piece of evidence In the *Viṣṇu-p* two hairs of Viṣṇu, one black and the other white, are said to have been incarnated as Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma respectively. [2] Thus Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma are incarnations of exceedingly small portions of Viṣṇu. But in the *Narasiṁha-p* it is two Śaktis of Viṣṇu, one black and the other white, which appear in the forms of Kṛṣṇa and (Bala-) Rāma respectively for the destruction of Kaṁsa and others [3] So the position of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma as incarnations of Viṣṇu is better in the *Narasiṁha-p* than in the *Viṣṇu* Now, the present *Vāyu-p*, with the exception of those of its chapters which were added later, being earlier than the present *Viṣṇu-p*, and the *Viṣṇu-p* being to be dated about 300 A D, the date of the *Narasiṁha-p* should be placed not earlier than about 400 A D This upper limit of the date of the present *Narasiṁha-p* is supported by its mention of week-days (viz, Arka-divasa and Guru-vāra) in chap 67 (verses 8 and 10 respectively), because the earliest epigraphic mention of a week-day is found in the Eran inscription of 484 A. D. [4]

Thus the date of the present *Narasiṁha-p* is to be placed between 400 and 500 A D. It is highly probable that this Purāṇa was written in the latter half of this century.

---

[1] For instance,

Narasiṁha-p		*Viṣṇu-p*
3, 23-28a		cf I, 5, 18-24
5, 3ff	=	I, 8, 1b-2, 7, 3ff.
25, 40b-41a	=	I, 6, 39.

[2] See *Viṣṇu-p.* V 1, 59-60—evaṁ saṁstūyamānas tu bhagavān parameśvaraḥ । ujjahārātmanaḥ keśau sita-kṛṣṇau mahāmune ॥ uvāca ca surān etau mat-keśau vasudhā-tale । avatīrya bhuvo bhāra-kleśa-hāniṁ kariṣyataḥ ॥

[3] *Nar* 53, 30b-31a, 33-34a and 66. For the texts of these verses see footnote 19 above.

[4] Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, pp. 88-89.

The introductory verses of the *Narasiṁha-p.* do not throw any light on the date of this Purāṇa As all the Mss do not agree in this respect, some of these introductory verses may be later additions Moreover, the date of these verses is uncertain The verses 'kim kim siṁhas tataḥ kim' is ascribed to Vyasa in the *Kavīndra-vacana-samuccaya* (ed Bibl Ind, p. 13) and Śrīdhara-dāsa's *Sadukti-karṇāmṛta* (ed. Bibl. Ind., p 53), and thus seems to have been taken from the *Narasiṁha-p.*

That a *Narasiṁha-p* was written at a fairly early date is shown not only by its mention in *all* the lists of Upapurāṇas[1] but also by the *Matsya-p* (53, 59) which says that the Upapuranas viz., *Nārasiṁha*, *Nandi-purāṇa*, *Sāmba* and *Āditya*, were 'well-established in society' (loke ....sampratiṣṭhitāḥ), thus testifying to a much earlier date of these Upapurāṇas But it is very difficult to say whether our present *Narasiṁha-p* is the same as that mentioned in these lists and in the *Matsya-p* The commentators and the Nibandha-writers are, however, quite sure of the identity of the two. Of these, Narasimha Vājapeyin even explains the shorter form of the present *Narasiṁha-p* saying, "As the number (of ślokas) of the famous *Nārasiṁha* is not found to be 18000, it seems that a portion has been lost in course of time"[2]

The above date of the present *Narasiṁha-p.* must not be taken to be that of the entire Purāṇa as found in the printed edition, because in the printed edition there are chapters and verses which are decidedly later interpolations. In order to be able to find out these spurious portions a list of such chapters and verses as are not found in all the Mss of the *Narasiṁha-p.* is given below with the mention of those Mss in which they occur and also of those in which they are not found

[1] For these lists and the date or formation of the group, see *ABORI*, Vol. XXI, pp. 38 ff

[2] *Nityācāra-pradīpa*, p. 18—prasiddha-nārasiṁhasya aṣṭādaśasāhasra-saṁkhyā yady api nopalabhyate kiṁcit kāla-kramāt luptam iti pratibhāti.

Chaps. and verses of the printed ed.	Mss. in which they are not found.	Mss. in which they occur.
1. Chap. 31, verses 1-97. (On the story of Dhruva)	(1) Ms noticed by R. L Mitra (2) Aufrecht's Ms (3) Keith's Ms (Cat No 6618) (4) Dacca University Mss Nos 2713, 323, 284A (5) R. L Mitra's Bikaner Ms (6) Ms ग used in the printed ed. Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, Cat Nos. 6616-17, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sanskrit College Mss ?	Mss क and ख used in the printed ed.
2. Chap 33, verses 15-85, chap. 34, verse 1 (On the story of the Pāndavas' killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlasiras).	(1) Ms noticed by Mitra (2) Aufrecht's Mss (3) Dacca University Mss Nos 2713, 323, 284A. (4) Mitra's Bikaner Ms (5) Ms ग used in the printed ed Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans. College Mss ?	Mss क and ख used in the printed ed
3 Chap. 34, verses 43-55a. (On Lakṣa-homa and Koṭi-homa)	Ms ग used in the printed ed.	All other Mss.

4 Chap. 36, verse 9a. (On the Buddha incarnation).	(1) Dacca Univ Mss Nos. 2713, 323, 284A. (Most probably also in the Mss of Mitra, Aufrecht, Eggeling, Keith, Shastri and Calcutta Sans College; otherwise the number of incarnations becomes 11 and not 10 as mentioned in *Nar.* 54, 6–daśāvatārāh kathitās tavaiva harer mayā etc).	Mss क, ख and also ग (?) used in the printed ed.
5. Chap. 40, verses 60b–61b, chaps. 41–43; chap 44, verses 1–13 (On the story of Prahlāda.)	(1) Ms noticed by Mitra. (2) Aufrecht's Mss. (3) Dacca Univ Mss Nos 2713, 323, 284A (4) Mitra's Bikaner (5) Ms ग used in the printed ed Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans College Mss ?	Mss क and ख used in the printed ed.
6 Chap. 54, verses 8–61. (On the evils of the Kali age.)	(1) Ms noticed by Mitra (2) Aufrecht's Mss. (3) Dacca Univ. Mss Nos.2713, 323, 284A Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans. College Mss ?	Mss क and ख used in the printed ed.

7. Chap. 61. (On Yoga)	(1) Aufrecht's Mss (2) Mss. क and ख used in the printed ed.	(1) Ms. noticed by Mitra (2) Dacca Univ. Mss Nos 2713, 323, 284A. (3) Ms ग used in the printed ed Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans College Mss ?
8 Chap. 63, verses 10-119a (On the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra.)	(1) Dacca Univ Mss. Nos 2713 and 323 (In the Dacca Univ Ms No 284A chap 57, verses 21-30 and chaps 58-64 of the printed ed do not occur at all) (2) Ms ग used in the printed ed. Most probably also in (1) Ms noticed by Mitra, (2) Aufrecht's Mss Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans College Mss ?	(1) Eggeling's Ms (Cat No 3378 In its comparatively modern portion) (2) Mss क and ख used in the printed ed

9. Chap. 64. (On the interlocution between Nārada and Puṇḍarīka on the glories of Nārāyana.)	(1) Ms noticed by Mitra (2) Eggeling's Mss. (3) Dacca Univ. Mss Nos. 2713 and 323 (In Dacca Univ. Ms No. 284A chap. 57, verses 21-30 and chaps 58-64 of the printed ed. do not occur at all) Also in (1) Keith's Mss, (2) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (3) (3) Calcutta Sans College Mss ?	(1) Aufrecht's Mss. (2) Eggeling's Ms. (Cat. No. 3378. In its modern portion.) (3) Mss क, ख and ग used in the printed ed.)
10. Chap. 65 (On the 68 holy places of the Vaiṣṇavas).	(1) Aufrecht's Ms No 138. (2) Mss क and ख used in the printed ed	(1) Ms noticed by Mitra. (2) Aufrecht's Ms No 139. (3) Eggeling's Mss (4) Dacca Univ Mss Nos 2713, 323, 284A. (5) Ms ग used in the printed ed Also in (1) Keith's Mss, (2) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (3) Calcutta Sans College Mss (especially in Ms No 36)?

11. Chap. 66 (On the praise of holy places.)	(1) Aufrecht's Ms. No. 138. (2) Dacca Univ. Ms No. 284A. (3) Calcutta Sans College Ms No 298. (4) Mss क and ख used in the printed ed.	(1) Ms. noticed by Mitra. (2) Aufrecht's Ms No. 139 (3) Eggeling's Mss. (4) Dacca University Mss Nos. 2713, 323 (5) Shastri's ASB Mss (especially Cat. No 4076.) (6) Ms ग used in the printed ed Also in (1) Keith's Mss, and (2) Calcutta Sans College Ms No 36 ?
12. Chap 67. (On the mental Tirthas, and the praise of the *Narasimha-p.*)	(1) Aufrecht's Ms No 138 (2) Dacca Univ Ms No 284A (3) Calcutta Sans College Ms No 298 (4) Mss क and ख used in the printed ed	(1) Ms noticed by Mitra. (2) Aufrecht's Ms No 139 (3) Eggeling's Mss (4) Dacca Univ Mss Nos 2713, 323 (5) Ms ग used in the printed ed
13. Chap 68 (On the praise of the *Narasimha-p.*).	(1) Ms noticed by Mitra (2) Eggeling's Mss (Cat Nos 3375-77) (3) Dacca Univ. Mss Nos. 2713, 323, 284A. (4) Calcutta Sans college Mss (Nos 36, 298) (5) Ms ग used in the printed ed Also in (1) Keith's Mss, and (2) Shastri's ASB Mss ?	(1) Aufrecht's Mss (2) Mss क and ख used in the printed ed

The above table shows that the following chapters, which are not contained in the older and better Mss, are ***undoubtedly spurious***, viz,

chap. 31, verses 1-97	on the story of Dhruva,
chap. 33, verses 15-85	on the story of the Pāndavas' killing the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlaśiras,
chap 36, verse 9a	on the Buddha incarnation,
chap. 40, verses 60b-61b, chaps 41-43, chap. 44, verses 1-13	on the story of Prahlāda,
chap 54, verses 8-61	on the evils of the Kali age,
chap. 63, verses 10-119a	on the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra,
chap 64	on the interlocution between Nārada and Puṇḍarīka on the glories of Nārāyana,
chap. 68	on the praise of the *Narasimha-p.*;

whereas the following chapters, viz,

chap. 34 (verses 43-55a)	on Laksa-homa and Koti-homa,
chap 61	on Yoga,
chap. 65	on the 68 holy places of the Vaisnavas,
chap 66	on praise of holy places,
and chap 67	on the mental Tīrthas, and the praise of the *Narasimha-p.*,

though eliminated in some Mss, are genuine.

The spurious character of the chapters and verses of the former group is also shown by their position, by the nature of their insertion, as well as by other evidences. For instance, the story of Dhruva in chap. 31, verses 1-97 is inserted so abruptly that none can have the slightest doubt regarding the fact that verses 98-113 of chap. 31 are direct continuations of the verses in chap. 30. As a matter of fact, chap 30 and verses 98-113 of chap. 31 of the printed ed form a single chapter in the Dacca Univer-

sity Mss.[1] Similarly, the story of the Pāṇḍavas' killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlaśiras in chap. 33 (verses 15-85) and chap. 34 (verse 1) separate verses 1-14 of chap. 33 and verses 2 ff of chap. 34 of the printed ed. which deal with the results of offering different articles to Visnu and of rendering various kinds of service to this deity and which thus rightly form a single chapter in the Dacca University Mss. Regarding the spurious character of verse 9a of chap 36 much has already been said in connection with the determination of the date of this Purāna. As to the chapters on the story of the Prahlāda, they are placed between verses 1-60a of chap. 40 and verses 14ff. of chap 44 of the printed ed which form one single chapter in the Dacca University Mss as well as in the Ms ग used in the printed edition. In these Mss, those verses, which are separated, with modifications, by the chapters on the story of Prahlāda in the printed ed, read, with slight variations, as follows:

gacchadhvam adhunā devāh svasthānam vigata-jvarāh ।
aham adya gamisyāmi indrasyendratva-siddhaye ॥
hiranya-kasipor nāśo bhavatām api vrddhaye ।
yusmākam vijayāyaiva ajayāya sura-dvisām ॥
mārkandeya uvāca ।
ity uktā visnunā devā natvā visnum yayur nrpa ।
bhagavān api deveśo nārasimham athākarot ॥
bahu-yojana-vistīrnam bahu-yojanam ayatam ।
atiraudram mahākāyam dānavānām bhayamkaram ॥
mahānetram mahavaktram mahādamstram mahānakham ।
mahābāhum mahāpādam kālāgni-sadrsopamam ॥
krtvettham nārasimham tu yayau visnus trivikramah ।
stūyamāno muni-ganair hiranya-kaśipoḥ purah ॥
nrsimhas tatra gatvā ca mahānādam nanāda ca ।
tan-nāda-śravanād daityā nārasimham avestayan ॥
tān hatva sakalāms tatra sva-paurusa-parākramāt ।
babhañja ca sabhām divyām hiranya-kaśipor nrpa ॥
etc. etc

How these verses have been changed in the printed edition in order to accommodate the chapters on the story of Prahlāda will

[1] As we have not been able to consult the other Mss of the *Narasimha-p.*, we refer only to the Dacca University Mss.

be obvious from a comparison of these verses with *Nar*. 40, 60ff and 44, 14 ff. The word 'yayau' in the line 'krtvettham nārasiṁham tu yayau visnus trivikramaḥ' which has been retained in the printed edition, does not agree with what has been said of Visnu in the story of Prahlāda. As regards the spuriousness of chap. 68 it can be said that the *Narasiṁha-p.* really ends with chap. 67, which deals not only with mental Tīrthas but also with the praise of the Purāṇa, and of which lines 24b-25a say, "Having heard (the Purāṇa topics) in company with the Snātakas (i. e. the sages who took their holy bath in the Ganges), Bharadvāja remained there after showing proper respect to Sūta, but the (other) sages went away". Further, though in several places of the *Narasiṁha-p.* unswerving (acalā, avyabhicāriṇī) Bhakti is mentioned and praised as the means of attaining the blissful state of existence,[1] it is only in some of those chapters which we have taken as spurious that there are mention and praise of Dāsyabhakti.[2] It is also noteworthy that none of these spurious chapters is referred to by any of the remaining chapters, though there are numerous cross references in the latter[3]

---

[1] See *Nar* 7, 33, 9, 6, 10 49 and 51, 11, 56 and 60, 32, 10, and so on

[2] Cf. prahlādo'bravīd dhīmān deva janmāntaresv api ı
dāsas tavāham bhūyāsaṁ garutmān iva bhaktimān ıı
Nar. 43, 78b-79a,
dāso ham vāsudevasya deva-devasya śārnginah ı
ityukto nāradenāsau bhakti-paryākulātmanā ıı *Nar*. 64, 46,
janmāntara-sahasresu yasya syād buddhir īdrśī ı
dāso'haṁ vāsudevasya deva-devasya śārṅgiṇah ı
prayāti visṇu-sālokyaṁ puruso nātra saṁśayah ıı *Nar*. 64, 94-95a.
Also cf *Nar* 64, 116-117

In *Nar* 33, 31 the demon Bahuroman says how in one of his previous births as a Brahman named Raivata, he was killed by the city-guards in a Visṇu-temple and was taken to heaven in a car which was 'prabhu-dāsa-samanvita'.

[3] *Nar*. 6, 2 refers to *Nar*. 5, 2, *Nar* 19, 4 refers to *Nar*. 5, 46-47, *Nar*. 20, 1 refers to *Nar*. 19, 23, *Nar*. 24, 1 (prathamaṁ tāvat svāyambhuvam manvantaraṁ tat-svarūpam kathitam) refers to *Nar*. 3, 8-9 and *Nar*. 5, 20 ff, *Nar* 24, 17c (pūrvoktaś chāyāyām utpanno manuh . . .) refers to *Nar*. 19, 13 and 15, *Nar*. 29, 9b (tasya caritam uparisṭād bhavisyati) refers to *Nar*. 32 ff, *Nar* 32, 1 refers to *Nar*. 29, 9, *Nar*. 32, 1-2 and 8 refer to chaps. 36 ff. (on incarnations of Visṇu), *Nar*. 35, 2 refers to *Nar*. 34, 47 (on Koṭi-homa), *Nar*. 36, 1 refers to *Nar*. 32, 1-2 and 8, *Nar*. 55, 1 refers to *Nar*. 45, 35-36, *Nar* 62, 2 refers to *Nar* 58, 92b-93a. The words 'kā vāvasthā kalau yuge' in *Nar*. 1, 20a refers to *Nar*. 54, 1-6 and not to the section on 'kaliyuga-lakṣaṇa' occurring in *Nar*. 54, 8-61.

The above table further shows that there were distinct stages in the process of addition and elimination of chapters and verses. For instance, Ms ग (used in the printed ed.) interpolates chaps. 36 (verse 9a), 54 (verses 8-61) and 64, but eliminates nothing, Dacca University Ms No 284A interpolates nothing but eliminates chaps 66 and 67, and Aufrecht's Ms No. 139 interpolates chaps 64 and 68 and eliminates chap 61. Aufrecht's Ms No. 138 not only combines all the interpolations and eliminations of the Dacca University Ms (No 284A) and Aufrecht's Ms. No 139 but also eliminates one chapter more, viz, chap 65. Mss क and ख (used in the printed ed) go a step further not only by combining all the interpolations and eliminations of Ms ग and Aufrecht's Ms No. 138 but also by interpolating chaps. 31 (verses 1-97), 33 (verses 15-85), 40 (verses 60b-61b), 41-43, 44 (verses 1-13) and 63 (verses 10-119a)

Even among the chapters other than those which have been differentiated above as spurious, there are some which are most probably comparatively late additions. Such chapters are especially *Nar* 6 (on the story of the birth of Vasistha and Agastya as sons of Mitra and Varuna) and *Nar* 7-18 (on the story of Mārkandeya, the story of Yama and Yamī, etc. narrated by Vyāsa to Śuka) In *Nar* 5, 48 ff. the names of those 13 daughters of Daksa who were given in marriage to Kaśyapa, are the following — Aditi, Diti, Danu, Aristā, Svarasā, Svasā, Surabhi, Vinatā, Tāmrā, Krodha-vaśā, Irā, Kadrū and Muni; but in *Nar* 6, 4-8 the list of the names of the '13 daughters' married to Kasyapa omits Aristā and Tāmrā but adds Kālā, Muhūrtā, Simhikā and Saramā, thus increasing the number to fifteen. Even in the Dacca University Mss the names of these '13 daughters' are different from those given in chap. 5.[1] It is to be noted that in *Nar* 5, 43 Muhūrtā is said to have been

[1] The text of verses 6b-7 of chap 6, as given in the Dacca University Mss, is as follows

aditir ditir danuh kālā (Ms 284A- kālī) muhūrtā simhikā munih ।
vratā (Ms 2713 - tāmrā) krodhā ca surabhir vinatā surasā (Ms 2713 - after marginal correction - sarasā) tathā (Ms 2713 -khasā) ।
kadrūś ca svarasā (Ms 248A omits the word 'svarasā' with a blank space) caiva yā tu devī śunī tathā (Ms 323 - devī śuci smṛtā) ।

given in marriage to Dharma. This disagreement between chap 5 (which deals with Pratisarga and cannot, therefore, be spurious) and chap. 6 seems to indicate the spurious character of the latter. In order to introduce this chapter the interpolator adds verse 2 (mitrā-varuna-putratvam vasisthasya katham bhavet etc) of chap. 5. It is, however, not improbable that only verses 6-8a (containing the names of the '13 daughters') are spurious, and not the entire chap. 6. As to the chaps. 7-18 (on the story of Mārkandeya, etc.), their introductory verse is as follows ·

> mārkandeyena muninā katham mrtyuh parājitah ı
> etad ākhyāhi me sūta *tvayaitat sūcitam purā* ıı

Though in chaps 1-6 of the printed ed there is no verse containing the mention of Mārkaṇdeya or of the way of his subduing Death, the expression 'tvavaitat sūcitam purā' refers to the verses

> bhrgoh khyātyām samutpannā laksmīr visnu-parigrahah ı
> tathā dhātā-vidhātārau khyātyām jātau sutau bhrgoh ıı
> āyatır niyatiś caiva meroh kanye suśobhane ı
> dhātur vidhātuś ca te bhārye tayor jātau sutāv ubhau ıı
> prānaś caiva mrkanduś ca mārkandeyo mrkandutah ı
> yena mrtyur jito vipra purā nārāyanāsrayāt ıı

which occur among those 12 verses which have been lost after verse 31 of chap. 5 of the printed ed but are found in chap 5 of the Dacca University Mss Hence the absence of the verse containing the mention of Mārkandeya in chaps. 1-6 of the printed ed is no cause for taking chaps 7-18 as spurious. These chapters are considered as interpolated, because *Nar.* 19, 4 refers to *Nar* 5, 46-47 ignoring the intervening chaps 7-18 and because Mārkandeya, who is called the great grandson of Bhrgu in the lost verses mentioned above, is mentioned as Bhrgu's grandson in chaps 7-12 [1] Of these twelve intervening chapters (7-18), chaps. 7-12 (dealing with the story of Mārkandeya) differ from chaps 13-18 in certain matters In the former six chapters (7-12) the use of the twelve-syllabled Mantra 'om namo bhagavate vāsudevāya' is prescribed more

[1] See *Nar.* 7, 10-12, 25, 27 etc., 8, 3 and 10, 9, 13, 12, 65.

than once; the name 'Krsna' for Visnu (also called Nārāyana) is given on many occasions; and the names 'Devakī-nandana', 'Vāsudeva' etc. also are found. Once Yama says,

"sugatim abhilasāmi vāsudevād aham api bhāgavate
sthitāntarātmā ।
madhu-vadha-vaśago'smi na svatantrah prabhavati
samyamane mamāpi krsnah ॥"

Hence these chapters, though not recognising Krsna as the Bhagavat himself, have a Bhāgavata tinge On the other hand, chaps. 13-18 have a Pāñcarātra stamp, because in these chapters Nārāyana and the eight-syllabled Mantra 'om namo nārāyanāya' are praised, and there is no mention of the name 'Krsna' That chap. 13 is a later addition is also shown by the absence of praise of Visnu or Vaisnavism in this chapter (dealing with Yama-Yamī-samvāda) except in the line 'cittam me nirmalam bhadre visnau rudre ca samsthitam' (spoken by Yama to Yamī) which gives, unlike the other chapters, the same place to Visnu and Rudra. As the interlocutors Śuka and Vyāsa of chaps. 13-18 are first introduced in chap 7, these chapters are most probably later than chaps. 7-12.

From what has been said above regarding the addition and elimination of chapters and verses in the present *Narasimha-p.*, it is clear that this Purāna has been revised on more occasions than one A comparison between the texts of the same extracts as quoted by different Smrti-writers and occurring in the printed ed., also lends strong support in this direction [1] The

[1] For instance, a comparison between *Nar*, 34, 6-12 and these very verses as quoted by Narasimha Vājapeyin in his *Nityācāra-pradipa*, pp 558-560, shows how single lines of the quoted passage have been expanded into verses in the printed ed For example, the line 'toyena bhaktyā samsnāpya visnu-loke mahīyate' (in *Nityācāra-pradipa*, p. 558) = the verse 'snāpya toyena payasā narasimham narādhipa । sarva-pāpa-vinirmukto visnu-loke mahīyate ॥ (*Nar*. 34, 6). the line 'snāpya dadhnā sakrd visnum visnu-lokam avāpnuyāt' (in *Nityācāra-pradipa*, p. 558) = the verse 'snāpya dadhnā sakrd yastu nirmalah priya-darśanah । visnu-lokam avāpnoti pūjyamānah s ruttamaih ॥' (*Nar*, 34, 7), and so on Again, a comparison between the texts of the verses quoted from the *Narasimha-p*, in *Madana-pārijāta*, pp. 301-2, *Smrti-tattva* I, p 411 and *Nityācāra-pradīpa*, p 617 shows that the texts of the *Narasimha-p*, used by Raghunandana and Narasimha Vājapeyin, agree more with that of the printed ed. than with the text used by Madanapāla.

verses and even large extracts, quoted by Hemādri from the '*Narasiṁha-p.*' on different kinds of Vratas[1] and donations but not found in the present *Narasiṁha-p*, show that the text of this Purāṇa as used by Hemādri was more extensive. Narasimha Vājapeyin explains the smaller bulk of the present *Narasiṁha-p.* saying, "As the number (of ślokas) of the famous *Narasiṁha* is not found to be 18000, it seems that a portion has been lost in course of time."[2]

The mention of Tulasī in chaps. 31 (verse 87) and 34 (verses 19 and 23) and in the additional verses contained in the Dacca University Mss in their chapters corresponding to chap. 57 of the printed ed., should not be taken to go against the above date of the *Narasiṁha-p* This mention is certainly due to later revisions of the Purāṇa, because, of the above-mentioned chapters containing the mention of Tulasī, chap. 31 (verses 1-97) has been found to be suprious; and *Nar* 34, 19 does not occur in the Ms ग used in the printed ed. Moreover, in chap. 33, which deals with the results of various kinds of service rendered to Viṣṇu and of offering different articles to this deity, there is mention of 'bilva-patra' but not of Tulasī; nor is Tulasī mentioned in chaps 56 (on the method of consecration of the images of Viṣṇu), 62 (on the Vedic method of Viṣṇu-worship) and 63 (on the popular method of Viṣṇu-worship)

It is probably due to the repeated revisions of the present *Narasiṁha-p.* that there are disagreements between a number of statements made even in those chapters which cannot be taken as spurious For instance, in *Nar* 3, 8 Svāyambhuva Manu is said to have been the son of Dakṣa and his wife born respectively from Brahmā's right and left thumbs, but in *Nar.* 5, 22 Svāyambhuva Manu is said to have given his daughter Prasuti in marriage to Dakṣa; in *Nar* 3, 3-5 Rudra is said to have been born of Brahmā's rage (rosa) but in *Nar.* 5, 4-5 it is said that when Brahmā was thinking of some worthy son at the beginning of the Brāhma Kalpa, the blue-red (nīla-lohita) Rudra is said to have appeared on Brahmā's lap as a child with a body half male and half female; in *Nar.* 4, 2-4 Brahmā is said to have

[1] viz, Narasiṁha-caturdaśī-vrata, Hari-vrata, Pātra-vrata, etc

[2] *Nityācāra-pradīpa*, p. 18.

created from his mind ten sons (viz, Marīci, Atri, Angiras, Pulaha, Kratu, Pulastya, Pracetas, Bhṛgu, Nārada and Vasiṣṭha), of whom Nārada took to abstention (nivṛtti-dharma), but in *Nar.* 5, 17-19 Brahmā is said to have created nine sons (Marīci and others, except Nārada) who were known as 'nine Brahmās', and so on

Though the *Narasiṁha-p* proposes to give 'in brief (saṁkṣepāt) the genealogies of kings which were elaborately dealt with in the Purāṇas',[1] the defects, found in these genealogies, seem to be due as much to the carelessness of the people of later ages in maintaining the correctness of these dynastic lists in their respective Mss as to their attempt at abridgment For instance, in chaps 22 and 27, the printed edition as well as the Dacca University Ms No 284A mentions Aja as the son of Dīrghabāhu, but the Dacca University Ms No 2713, though following the printed ed in chap 27, gives the pedigree of Aja as 'dīrghabāhor dilīpah dilīpad raghuh raghor ajah' in chap 22, in chaps 22 and 27, the printed ed as well as the Dacca University Ms No 284A makes Māndhātṛ son of Asaṁhatāśva (v l Asaṁkhyātāśva in chap. 22 of the printed ed), but in chap 27 they give a popular verse in which Māndhātṛ is called Yauvanāśva (i e son of Yuvanāśva) the latter pedigree of Māndhātṛ is supported by the Dacca University Ms No 2713 which mentions Māndhātṛ as the son of Yuvanāśva in chap 22 (yuvanāśvān māndhātā), after *Nar.* 27, 1 the Mss used in the printed ed. have lost an extract[2] which is found in the Dacca University Mss Nos 2713 and 284A, and so on There are, of course, a few cases in which the disagreements are either to be removed by referring to other better Mss or to be ascribed to the revisions to which the extant *Narasiṁha-p* was subjected For instance, different pedigrees of Soma are given in chaps 23 and 28 of the printed edition as well as the Dacca University Mss

---

[1] *Nar* 22 2 Also see *Nar* 23, 1

[2] viz, 'tat-putro venas tasya pṛthus tasya pṛthāśvah (Ms No 284A omits 'pṛthāśvah') । pṛthāśvād asaṁhatāśvah । te catvaro rājāno bhūri-tejasah kramād rājyaṁ kṛtvā (Ms No 284A reads 'labdhvā' for 'kṛtvā') dharmato hariṁ ananta- (Ms No 284A inserts '°bhoga°' after 'ananta-') śayanaṁ ārādhya bhaktyā (Ms No 284A omits 'bhaktya') kratubhis ceṣṭvā svarlokaṁ gatah ।'

in chap. 22 Saudāsa's son is called Śatrumdama in the printed edition as well as in the Dacca University Ms No. 284A, and Śatrundana in the Dacca University Ms No 2713, but in chap. 27 he is called Satrasava in the printed edition, Satreśvara in the Dacca University Ms No 284A, and Satyaśrava in the Dacca University Ms No. 2713, and so on.

The disagreements in the names and pedigrees of some of the kings in chaps 22–23 (on the genealogies of the kings of the solar and lunar dynasties) on the one hand and chaps 27–29 (on vaṁśānucarita, i e the accounts of the kings of these dynasties) on the other, are not real but are due to the editor of this Purāṇa who has not used sufficient number of Mss for his edition For instance, in chap 22 Pṛthāśva's son is Asaṁkhyātāśva in the Dacca University Mss, while in chap 27 he is called Asaṁhatāśva in the printed ed as well as in the Dacca University Mss; in chap 23 Māndhātṛ's son is called Purukutsa in the printed ed. as well as in the Dacca University Mss Nos. 284A and 2713, but in chap 27 māndhātṛ's son is named Purukuśya in the printed ed., Kurupuccha in the Dacca University Ms. No 284A, and Purukutsa in the Dacca University Ms No 2713; in chap 27 Dīrghabāhu's father is named Anarana in the printed ed and Anaranya in the Dacca University Mss as well as in the Ms π used in the printed ed. but in chap 27 he is called Anaranya in all these sources; in chap. 22 Padma's son is Anuparṇa in the printed ed and Ṛtuparna in the Dacca University Mss, but in chap. 27 he is called Ṛtuparna in all these sources, and so on.

Though the *Matsya-p*,[1] the *Skand-p.*[2] and the Revā-māhātmya[3] attach the '*Narasiṁha-p.*' to the *Padma-p.* as a

---

[1] upabhedān pravaksyāmi loke ye saṁpratiṣṭhitāḥ ।
pādme purāṇe tatroktaṁ narasiṁhopavarṇanam ।
taccāṣṭādaśasāhasraṁ nārasiṁham ihocyate ॥ *Matsya-p.* 53, 59.

This verse is quoted by Hemādri (in his *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi*, I, p. 533, and II, i, p 21), Narasiṁha Vājapeyin (in his *Nityācāra-pradīpa*, p. 18), Jīva Gosvāmin (in his commentary, called *Krama-saṁdarbha*, on *Bhāgavata* XII, 7, 17–22) and Mitra Miśra (in his *Vīramitrodaya*, Paribhāṣā-prakāśa, p 14) Mitra Miśra does not quote the first line

[2] VII, (Prabhāsa-kh.), i, 2, 79b–80. This verse is the same as *Matsya-p* 53, 59 quoted above

[3] See Aufrecht, *Bodleian Catalogue*, p. 65 The Revā-māhātmya claims to be a part of the *Vāyu-p*.

sub-division (upabheda) of the latter, the present *Narasiṁha-p.* always calls itself a 'Purāṇa'[1] and never an Upapurāṇa, nor does it attach itself to any Mahāpurāṇa for the sake of authority. As a matter of fact, in chap. 1, verses 33-34 it speaks of the five characteristics of 'Purāṇa', viz., sarga, pratisarga, vaṁśa, manvantara and vaṁśānucarita, and proposes to deal with all these topics, and in chap 67, verses 17-18 it says that it has dealt with the five topics, viz, sarga, pratisarga etc, but it betrays no knowledge of the Upapurāṇas So, it is evident that though according to later tradition the *Narasiṁha-p* is classed as an Upapurāṇa, it is really an independent 'Purāṇa' like the *Vāyu*, *Viṣṇu* etc

It has already been said that the present *Narasiṁha-p* knows the extant *Vāyu* and *Viṣṇu* and the earlier *Varāha-p* Its mention of the word 'Purāṇa' in the plural number on several occasions to mean distinct Purāṇic works, shows that more Purāṇas than one came into existence before its composition.[2] It is not known whether the *Mārkaṇḍeya-p.* or the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is referred to in chap. 10 (verses 54-55) which seems to be a later addition

A careful examination of the original and the spurious chapters of the present *Narasiṁha-p* shows that this Purāṇa was originally a work of the Pāñcarātra sect with remarkable Bhāgavata inclination The Pāñcarātras themselves added a few more chapters and extracts at a later date It was then considerably changed by the Bhāgavatas with further additions and alterations

The entire *Narasiṁha-p.*, as we have it now, is not composed in verse There are a few chapters and extracts which are written in simple prose These are the following — *Nar* 19, 7-23 (on the birth of the Asvins), chap 21 (on the origin of the Maruts); 22, 4-15 (on the names of the kings of the solar race). 23, 2-13 (on the names of the kings of the lunar race); 24, 1-36 (on the Manvantaras), 27, 1-12 (on the accounts of the kings of the

[1] See *Nar* 1, 25, 1, 24, 1, 29, 67, 17, 67, 21, 22 and 25 See also the chapter-colophons In the Mss also the *Narasiṁha-p.* is called a 'Purāṇa'.

[2] See *Nar* 1, 24 (vyāsa-prasādāj jānāmi purāṇāni tapodhanāh), 22, 2 (rājñāṁ vaṁśah purāṇeṣu vistareṇa prakīrtitah), 56, 10b-11a, 58, 108.

solar race); 28, 1-16 (on the accounts of the kings of the lunar race); 29, 1-12 (on the accounts of the kings of the lunar race); 30, 2-16 (except 5, which is a verse); 52, 25-31 A portion of chap. 9 is written in a peculiar metre with 25 syllables in each line.

The language of the *Narasiṁha-p.* contains numerous solecisms. For instance, it has 'abhūvan' for 'abhavan' (*Nar* 1, 62), 'vyajāyata' for 'vyajanayat' (*Nar* 5, 21), 'jajñe' for 'janayāmāsa' (*Nar.* 5, 29, 31 and 35), 'snāyanti' for 'snānti' (*Nar.* 6, 26), 'vedavidaih' for 'vedavidbhih' (6, 46), 'susaṁgītavidaih' for ''vidbhih' (34, 36), 'mātr-pitarau' for 'mātāpitarau' (7, 14), 'vīksayāmāsa' for 'vīksāmāsa' (14, 23), 'vartatīm' for 'vartamānām' (19, 15), 'manujām' for 'manujānām' (18, 12), 'pravartatīm' for 'pravartamānām' (19, 17), and so on.

Like the other Purānic works, the *Narasiṁha-p.* also tries to give itself a garb of great sanctity and high antiquity by tracing its descent from Brahmā. In chap. 67, verses 19-22 it gives the following tradition of inheritance:— Brahmā himself spoke out this Purāna to the sages Marīci and others; the next recipient was Mārkandeya, who then narrated it to a king of the Nāga family;[1] Vyāsa then received it through Narasimha's favour.

Nar. 57 (verses 8 to the end) and 58-61, which deal with the duties of the four castes and orders of life, are found printed word for word under the title *Hārīta-saṁhitā* in the *Ūnaviṁśati Saṁhitā*.[2] These chapters also appear as *Laghu-hārīta-smṛti* in Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara's *Dharmaśāstra-saṁgraha* (Vol. I, pp. 172 ff). Now, the question arises as to whether it was the *Hārīta-saṁhitā* (or *Laghu-hārīta-smṛti*) which was incorporated in the *Narasiṁha-p.*, or the above-mentioned chapters of the *Narasiṁha-p.* were given the character of an independent Smrti work under the title '*Hārīta-saṁhitā*' (or *Laghu-hārīta-smṛti*). An examination of the *Hārīta-saṁhitā* shows that it was the

[1] For the reading 'rājño nāga-kulasya ha' of the printed ed., the Dacca University Mss Nos. 323 and 2713 read 'rājño vai nākulasya ha' and 'rājño vai nahusasya ha' respectively

[2] Edited (with a Bengali translation) by Pañcānana Tarkaratna and published by the Vangavāsī Press, Calcutta Second edition, 1316 B S.

above-mentioned chapters of the present *Narasimha-p.* which were taken off and given the form of an independent work under the title '*Hārīta-saṁhitā*' (or '*Laghu-hārīta-smṛti*') which was derived from the name of the original speaker Hārīta The *Hārīta-saṁhitā* begins as follows

ye varṇāśrama-dharmasthās te bhaktāḥ keśavam prati ।
iti pūrvam tvayā proktam bhūr bhuvaḥ svar dvijottamāḥ ॥
varṇānām āśramāṇām ca dharmān no brūhi sattama ।
yena saṁtuṣyate devo nārasiṁhaḥ sanātanaḥ ॥
mārkaṇḍeya uvāca ।
atrāham kathayiṣyāmi purā vṛttam anuttamam ।
ṛṣibhiḥ saha saṁvādam hārītasya mahātmanaḥ ॥

Of these verses, which are the same as *Nar* 57, 8-10, the first shows that something has already been said, of which these verses form a continuation, and in fact the first verse points to *Nar* 57, 2-7 wherein Mārkaṇḍeya, being asked by king Sahasrānīka, enumerates the characteristics of the devotees of Viṣṇu thus ·

viṣṇu-bhaktā mahotsāhā viṣṇvarcana-vidhau sadā ।
saṁyatā dharma-sampannaḥ sarvārthān sādhayanti te ॥
paropakāra-niratā guru-śuśrūṣaṇe ratāḥ ।
varṇāśramācārayutāḥ sarveṣām supriyaṁvadāḥ ॥
&c &c

Though from a perusal of the *Hārīta-saṁhitā* we understand that Mārkaṇḍeya reports to a king named Sahasrānīka what Hārīta said to the sages on the duties of the four castes and orders of life, nothing is said in the *Hārīta-saṁhitā* either about the identity of these two persons or about the occasion, time or place in which they met each other Even the name of the king is given as late as in chap. 7 (verse 20). But it is the *Narasiṁha-p* which tells us who king Sahasrānīka was and how he met the sage Mārkaṇḍeya We have already said that the *Narasiṁha-p* is a work meant for the glorification of the worship of Narasiṁha This character is betrayed by the *Hārīta-saṁhitā* also [1] Moreover, none of the quotations made in their works by Viśvarūpa, Aparārka, Bhavadeva, Jīmūtavāhana, Devanabhaṭṭa and Ani-

[1] See its introductory verse quoted above, see also *Hārīta-saṁhitā* 2, 9, 4, 75-76a, 7, 19.

ruddha-bhatta from Hārīta, Vrddha-hārīta, Laghu-hārīta, Brhaddhārīta and Svalpa-hārīta is to be met with in our so-called *Hārīta-samhitā*. On the other hand, some of the quotations made by Aparārka from the '*Nrsimha-p*' are traceable in the *Hārīta-samhitā*. For example,

the verses quoted from the '*Nrsimha-p*' in Aparārka's commentary on the *Yajnavalkya-smrti*,		*Hārīta-samhita*
p 79	=	3, 12
p 125	=	4, 18-20,
p 153	=	4, 60-61,
p 189	=	4, 71, 72a, and 73a,
p 965	=	6, 11b-22.

These show that the chapters, now known as *Hārīta-samhitā* or *Laghu-hārīta-smrti*, originally belonged to the *Narasimha-p.* These chapters seem to be based on different Smtti works such as the *Parāśara-smrti* and the *Hārīta-dharmaśāstra* (as known to Devanabhatta), because *Parāśara-smrti* I, 50 (vaiśvadeve tu samprāpte etc,) greatly resembles *Nar.* 58, 100-101a (akrte vaiśvadeve tu etc), and the verses 'anena vidhinā yo hi āśramān upasevate etc' quoted from the '*Hārīta-dharmaśāstra*' in *Smrti-candrikā* I, p 174 slightly resembles *Nar* 58, 37 (evam yo vidhim āsthāya etc.)

Here we should like to say a few words on the contents of the *Narasimha-p* as known to some of the Nibandha-writers In his *Smrtitattva* I, p 351 Raghunandana quotes from the *Narasimha-p.* twenty-four metrical lines on general maxims (naya), such as 'One should give salutary advice to his friend in proper time, even though the latter does not ask for it' 'One should not begin any work which may create repentance in the end', 'One who believes the servants of the king or the bastards, do not live long', 'One should not allow the remaining part of the enemies, debt and fire to continue, because these increase again', and so on. He also quotes in *Smrti-tattva* I, p 827 a verse on the proper time for marriage In his *Smrti-tattva* II, p 66 Raghunandana quotes from the same source a verse in which 'Tulasī' and 'Kṛṣṇa-tulasī' have been mentioned as pleasing to Hari. In his

Vidhāna-pārijāta I, p. 451 Anantabhatta quotes from the '*Nārasiṁha*' seventeen metrical lines on dressing a child with clothes for the first time. In his *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi* II, ii, pp 41-49 Hemādri quotes a large extract of 173 metrical lines on a vow called Narasiṁha-caturdaśī which was given in the '*Narasiṁha-p.*' in connection with the Narasiṁha-prādurbhāva In this extract Nṛsiṁha, being asked by Prahlāda as to how he became devoted to Nṛsiṁha and was blessed with good, says that in his previous birth Prahlāda was a Brahman named Vāsudeva and was addicted to a prostitute and that this Vāsudeva performed no other good deed than a Vrata of Nṛsiṁha. Prahlāda again asked Nṛsiṁha to narrate in details the whole story. Consequently Nṛsiṁha said that in the city of Avantī there was a famous Brahman named Susarman who mastered all the Vedas and performed all his duties This Susarman had a chaste and devoted wife named Suśīlā, who gave birth to five worthy sons, of whom Vāsudeva was the youngest. Unlike the other brothers, Vāsudeva was addicted to prostitutes, became a drunkard and stole gold for financing his evil deeds. Once he quarrelled with that prostitute and kept awake throughout the whole night without taking food The prostitute also did so Thus Vāsudeva unconsciously performed the Vrata of Nṛsiṁha, was born as Prahlāda, and became devoted to Nṛsiṁha The prostitute became an Apsaras Next, being asked by Prahlāda to describe the Vrata in details, Nṛsiṁha did so Hemādri also quotes verses on Hari-vrata, Pātra-vrata, and offer of different articles such as Kamaṇḍalu, fruits foot-wear, unbrella, clothes etc. to the Pitṛs in Śrāddha ceremonies Sulapāṇi also quotes verses on Srāddha in his *Vrata-kāla-viveka*, *Śrāddha-viveka* and *Tithi-viveka*. It is needless to say that none of these verses is found in the present *Narasiṁha-p*

APPENDIX I

Edited by Uddhavācārya and published by Gopal Narayan & Co, Bombay, Second edition, Bombay 1911.

This is a very careless edition based on three Mss which have been referred to simply as क, ख and ग, but of which no information or description has been given by the editor

In this edition, the chapter immediately following chap 10 is called eleventh at the beginning but twelfth at the end. As a matter of fact, chaps 11 and 12 have been combined without any demarcation, though Ms ग says that chap 12 begins from verse 54.

Though I am fully conscious of the fact that no serious chronological deduction should be based on this worthless edition, the absence of any better, or even a second, edition of this Purāṇa has compelled me to utilise it here I have however, consulted the three Mss preserved in the Dacca University Library and have not used any evidence which is not supported at least by these Mss.

For Mss of this Purāṇa see,

(1) R. L Mitra, *Notices* of *Sanskrit Mss*, iii, pp 1-5, No. 1020.

[This Ms which consists of 63 chapters and was found at Navadvīpa is written in Bengali characters and dated Saka 1567 It begins as follows -

om namo nṛsiṃhāya ।
tapta-hātaka-keśāgra-jvalat-pāvaka-locana ।
vajrādhika-nakha-sparśa divya-simha namo'stu te ॥
nakha-mukha-vilikhita-diti-tanayorah-paripatad-asṛg-
aruṇīkṛta-gātrah ।
himakara-giririva gairika-gātro naraharir aharahar
avatu sa hy asmān ॥
himavad-vāsinah sarve munayo veda-pāragah ।
tri-kāla-jñā mahātmāno naimiṣāranya-vāsinah ॥

&c. &c

and end thus.

netrair mārtaṇda-caṇdais tribhir anala-śikhā nyagvahadbhiḥ
pradīptaḥ

pāyād vo nārasimhah kara-khara-nakharair bhinna-daityas
ciradyah ।
kim kim simhas tatah kim nara-sadrśa-vapur deva citram grhītā
naivam dhik konvajīved drutam upanayatām so' pi satyam
harīśah ।
śāpam cāpam nakhāngam jhatiti daha daha karkaśatvam
nakhānām
ity evam daitya-nātham nija-nakha-kuliśair jaghnivān yah
sarosāt ॥
iti śrīnarasimhapurāne ādye dharmartha kama-mokṣa-pradāyini
para-brahma-svarupina idam ekam sunispannam dhyeyo
nārāyanah sadā narānvadevat param asti kimcit ।
śrīnarasimhapurānam samāptam ॥ 63 ॥

The list of its contents, as given by Mitra, shows that it lacks the story of Dhruva as occurring in chap 31, verses 1-97 of the printed edition, the story of Prahlāda as given in chaps 40 (verses 60b-61b), 41-43 and 44 (verses 1-13) of the printed edition, the description of the characteristic evils of the Kali age as given in chap 54, verses 8-61 of the printed edition as well as the chaps 64 (on the interlocution of Nārada and Pundarīka on the glories of Nārāyana) and 68 (on the glorification of the *Narasimha-p*) of the printed edition

It also seems to lack the story of the Pandavas killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlasiras on the bank of the Revā for carrying away Draupadī by force (as given in chap 33, verses 15-85 and chap 34, verse 1 of the printed ed), and the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra 'om namo nārāvanāya' (as found in chap. 63, verses 10-119a of the printed ed)

It inserts a chapter on praise of holy places (tīrthapraśamsā) in Ayodhyā immediately after the chapters on Rāma-pradurbhāva]

(2) Aufrecht, *Bodleian Catalogue* pp 82-83, No. 138-139

[(1) Ms. No 138, which consists of 62 chapters and is written in Devanāgarī scripts, begins as follows -

nārāyanam namaskitya etc

tapta-hātaka-keśānta jvalat-pavaka-locana(h) ।

vajrādhika-nakha-sparśa divya simha namo'stu te ॥

pātu vo narasiṁhasya nakha-lāngala-kotayah ।
hiranya-kaśipo vraksa asrkkaddamamārunāh ॥
homavaddhāgninah sarve munayo veda-pāragāh ।
tri-kāla-jñā mahātmāno naimisāranya-vāsinah ॥
o &c.

but its d and final colophon are not given by Aufrecht

Aufrecht's description of its contents shows that it not only lacks, like Mitra's Ms, the stories of Dhruva and Prahlāda and the description of the characteristics of the Kali age, but also the topics on Yoga (as found in chap. 61 of the printed ed), and the enumeration of Tīrthas (as found in chaps. 65 67 of the printed ed)

It also seems to lack the story of the killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlaśiras by the Pāndavas, and the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra

The story of Rāma-prādurhhāva is given in this Ms in five chapters as against six (viz , 47-52) of the printed ed. (See also Dacca University Ms No 2713, described below, which also gives in five chapters the contents of chaps. 47-52 of the printed ed.)

It does not insert any chapter on praise of holy places in Ayodhyā.

(ii) Ms No 139, which is written in Devanāgarī, is generally the same as the above Ms. but contains chaps 65-67 (on Tīrthas) of the printed ed]

(3) Eggeling, *India Office Catalogue*, VI, pp 1211-14, Nos 3375-79

[(i) Of these five Mss, the first (Cat No 3375), which was copied in Devanāgarī scripts in 1798 A.D , consists of 67 chapters It begins with the verses ' tapta-hātaka-keśāgra ' and 'nakha-mukha-vidalita (v. l vilikhita) -diti-tanayorah°' (with slight variations in readings) and ends thus -

nrsimhāsya-mahādeva-pūjite bhakta-vatsale ।
loka-nāthe prabhau tena trailokya-pūjito bhavet ॥
yo narasimha-vapur āsthitah purā
hitāya lokasya diteh sutam yudhi ।
nakhaih sutīksnair vidadāra vairinam
divaukasām tam pranamāmi keśavam ॥
iti srīnrsimhapurāne ādye dharmārtha-kāma-moksa-pradāyinī nāma sattīrtha-varnano nāmādhyāyah ॥

It lacks chaps. 64 and 68 of the printed ed.

As Eggeling does not give the contents of the chapters, we do not know definitely whether this Ms also lacks the stories of Dhruva and Prahlāda, the story of the Pāndavas' killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlaśiras, the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra, and the description of the evils of the Kali age It is also not known whether it inserts a chapter on holy places in Ayodhyā

(ii) The next two Mss (Cat Nos 3376-77), which also are written in Devanāgarī and of which the second one lacks the first Adhyāya, are practically the same as the preceding Ms Their concluding verses are (with some variations in readings) the same as those of the Ms noticed by Mitra, and their colophon is as follows -

iti śrīnārasimhapurāne ādye dharmārtha-kāma-moksa-pradāyini para-brahma-svarupini idam ekam sunipannam dhyeyo nārāyanah sadā i na vāsudevāt param asti kimcit ii iti nārasimha-purānam samāptam ii

(iii) The fourth Ms (Cat No 3378) is written in Devanāgarī by different hands It was copied in about 1500-1600 A. D, its last five folios being supplied in 1789 A D It begins with the verse 'nakha-mukha-vihkhita-diti-tanayorah°'. In the modern portion of this Ms the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra (as found in chap 63, verses 10 119a of the printed ed) and the interlocution between Nārada and Pundarīka on the glories of Nārāyana (as occurring in chap 64 of the printed ed) are given

(iv) The fifth Ms (Cat No 3379 on Rāma-prādurbhāva) is written in Devanāgarī and divided into six sections named after the six Kāndas (ending with the Lankā-kānda) of the *Rāmāyana.* It is practically the same as chaps 47-52 of the printed ed]

(4) Hrishikesh Shastri and Shivachandra Gui, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss in the Library of the Calcutta Sanskrit College* (hereinafter referred to as *Cal Sans Coll Cat*), IV, pp. 29-30 (Ms. No 36) and pp 184-5 (Ms No 298)

[(i) Ms. No. 36 consists of 63 chapters and is written in Bengali characters It is described by Shastri and Gui as "not old." It begins with the verses 'tapta-hāṭaka-keśāgra' and 'nakha-mukha-vilasita-dititanayorah°,' and ends thus

prasanne deva-deveśe sarva-pāpaksayo bhavet i

pakṣinaḥ pāpa-baddhās te muktim yānti parām gatim ॥
nakhaiḥ sutīkṣṇair vvidadāra vairinam
divaukasām tam praṇamāmi keśavam ॥
vyāsrg-bhūd-bhinna-bhāsvat-pṛthu-lalita-laṭācchādita
kintvamārgaḥ ।
pātālam prāpta-pādaḥ prakharatara-nakha-śrotaso
nārasimhaḥ ॥
kara-khara-nakharaiḥ bhinna-vṛtyāś ciram vaḥ ॥
kim kim siddhas tat kinvaḥ sadisa-vapumetava citram gihīto
nevādhikaḥ so' pi jīvendratamapanayatām sopi nitvam
harīśaḥ ।
cāpamajasraganairdaśaijaghnivān yaḥ sa rosate ॥
iti śrīnarasimhapurāṇe trisastitamo' dhyāyaḥ samāptam cedam
narasimhapurāṇam ॥

This Ms lacks at least chap. 61 of the printed ed.

In spite of its numerous mistakes it seems to resemble much the Ms described by Mitra as well as Dacca University Ms No 2713 described below

(ii) Ms No. 298 is a 'very old' one written in Bengali scripts It consists of 67 chapters It begins with the verse taptahātaka-keśāgra' and ends with the chapter dealing with the 68 holy places secred to Viṣṇu (vaiṣṇavāṣṭaṣaṣṭi = chap. 65 of printed ed.) It lacks at least chaps. 66-68 of the printed ed

As the contents of the different chapters of these two Mss are not given in the Catalogue, it is not possible to say which more chapters of the printed editon are wanting in these two Mss]

(5) Haraprasad Shastri, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss in the Collections of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (hereinafter referred to simply as *ASB Cat*), V, pp 711-13, Nos 4076-81

[(i) No 4076 It is written in Bengali scripts and dated Śaka 1617 It consists of 64 chapters, of which the 63rd chapter is named 'Tīrtha-yātrā-praśaṃsā' (=chap 66 of the printed ed.). The Catalogue gives us no information regarding the contents of the different chapters

(ii) No 4076A It is written in Bengali characters and dated Saka 1586 No information regarding the number of its chapters or their contents is given by Shastri.

(iii) Nos. 4077-81. Of these five Mss the first is written in Kashmiri and dated Samvat 1898, the second is written in

Nāgara of the 18th century, and the remaining three are written in Bengali scripts. Of these remaining three Mss the first is dated Śaka 1623 and the third is dated Śaka 1639

The numbers of chapters of these five Mss or their contents are not mentioned in the Catalogue]

(6) A B Keith, *Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakrit Mss in the Library of the India Office*, Vol II, Part i, p 916 (Nos. 6616-18)

[(i) No 6616 It is written in Grantha characters of about 1866-67 A. D and consists of 61 chapters Its beginning is very defective, and it ends with the verse 'yo nārasimham vapur āsthitah purā' Its colophon runs as follows - iti srīnarasimha-purāne ekasastitamo' dhyāyah । srī-laksmī-nārasimhārpanam astu ॥ harih om । kara-kitam aparādham ksantum arhanti santah.

(ii) No 6617 — It is an incomplete Ms written in Bengali characters of about 1800 A D It begins with the same verses as those of Eggeling No 3375

(iii) No 6618 — It deals only with geography and is not divided into chapters It corresponds to chaps 30 and 31 (verses 98 112) of the printed ed and lacks the story of Dhruva as found in chap 31, verses 1-97 of the printed ed

(7) Dacca University Mss Nos 2713, 323, and 284A

[(i) Ms No 2713, which was collected from Vaidyavātī in the district of Hoogly, is written in Bengali characters and consists of 98 folios, of which fol 1 is damaged and fol 2 is mutilated at the left side It contains 63 chapters and is dated Saka 1567 It is fairly correct Like Mitra's Ms, it begins with the verses 'tapta-hātaka-keśāgra' and 'nakha-mukha-vilikhita-diti-tanayorah°', and ends thus

prasanne deva-devese sarva-pāpa-ksayo bhavet ।
prakṣīṇa-pāpa-bandhas te muktim yānti param punah ॥
yo nārasimham vapur āsthitah purā
hitāya lokasya ditch sutam yudhi ।
nakhaih sutīksnair vidadāra vairinam
divaukasām tam pranamāmi keśavam ॥
vyājṛmbhad-bhinna-bhāsvat-pṛthu-lalita-śatācchā-
ditārkendu-mārgah
pātāla-prāpta-pāda-prakhara-nakha-prota-śesāhi-bhogah ।
netrair mārtanda-candais tribhir anala-śikhām
udvahadbhih pradīptah

pāyād vo nārasimhah kara-khara-nakharair bhinna-
daityaś ciradyah ॥
kim kim simhas tatah kim nara-sadṛśa-vapur deva
citram gṛhīto
naivam dhik ko nu jīvet drutam upanayatām sopi
satyam hailsah ।
cāpam cāpam na khadgam jhatiti daha daha karka-
satvam nakhānām
ityevam daitya nātham nija-nakha-kulisan jaghnivān
yah sarosāt ॥

iti śrīnarasimhapurāne ādye dharmārtha kāma-moksa-pradā-
yini parambrahma-svarūpini idam ekam sunispannam dhyeyo
nārāyanah sadā । na vāsudevāt param asti kiñcit śrīnarasimha
purāṇam samāptam । śrīrāma-cakravartinah pustakam idam ।
śrīgopāla-sarmanah svāksaram idam । subham astu śakābdah
1567 ॥ terīkha 23 jyaisthah ॥ astamyām suklapakse tu guru-vāre
samāptas cāyam granthah ॥

The corresponding chapters in this Ms and the printed ed are the following —

Ms		*Printed ed*
Chaps 1–29	=	Chap 1–29 respectively
Chap. 30	=	Chaps 30 and 31 (verses 98–113)
Chap 31	=	Chap 32
Chap. 32	=	Chap 33 (verses 1–14), Chap 34 (verses 2–55)
Chaps 33–37	=	Chaps 35–39 respectively
Chap 38	=	Chap 40 (except verses 60b–61b), Chap 44 (verses 14–43).
Chaps 39–44	=	Chaps 45–50 respectively
Chap 45	=	Chaps 51–52
Chap. 46 (on holy places in Ayodhyā)	=	×
Chap. 47	=	Chap. 53.
Chap 48	=	Chap. 54 (verses 1–6)
Chap 49	=	Chap 54, verse 7, Chap 55
Chap 50	=	Chap. 56
Chap 51 (except about 25 additional verses on selection of flowers and leaves for Visnu worship)	=	Chap 57 (verses 1–7)
Chap 52	=	Chap 57 (verses 8–30)
Chap 53	=	Chap 58 (verses 1–16).
Chap. 54	=	Chap. 58 (verses 17–38)
Chap. 55	=	Chap 58 (verses 39–115)
Chaps 56–59	=	Chaps 59–62 respectively
Chap. 60	=	Chap 63 (verses 1–9 and 119b–122).
Chaps. 61–63	=	Chaps 65–67 respectively.

The above table shows that this Ms lacks the following sections of the printed ed.—

Chap 31, verses 1-97	—	on the story of Dhruva,
chap 33, verses 15-85, chap 34, verse 1	—	on the story of the killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlaśiras by the Pāndavas,
chap 40, verses 60b-61b chaps 41-43, chap 44, verses 1-13	—	on the story of Prahlāda,
chap 54, verses 8-61	—	on the characteristic evils of the Kali age,
chap 63, verses 10-119a	—	on the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra,
chap 64	—	dealing with the interlocution between Nārada and Pundarīka on the glories of Nārāyana;
chap 68 ..	—	on the glorification of the *Narasimha-p*

On the other hand, the printed edition lacks chap 46 (on holy places in Ayodhyā) and about 25 verses (on the selection of leaves and flowers for Visnu-worship) of chap 51 of the Ms

This Ms deals with the story of Rāma-prādurbhāva in five chapters (viz, 41-45) as against six (viz, 47-52) of the printed ed, chap 45 of the former consisting of chaps 51-52 of the latter

The agreement between this Ms and that described by Mitra is very close, and as both these Mss were copied in Śaka 1567, they are either based on the same original or derived from the same archetype

(ii) Ms No. 323, which was procured from Ulā in the district of Nadia, is written in Bengali characters and consists of 131 folios, of which fols, 37-40 (containing chaps 19-27, and verses 1-16 of chap 28 ,of the printed ed) are missing and fol 131 is wrongly numbered 139 It contains 64 chapters and is dated Saka 1588

It begins and ends with the same verses (though with occasional variations in readings) as the preceding Ms, and its final colophon (viz, iti śrī-narasimha-purāne ādye dharmārtha-moksa-

pradāyini parambrahma-svarūpini idam ekam suniṣpannam dhyeyo nārāyaṇah sadā । na vāsudevāt param asti kimcit nārasimha-purāṇam samāptam । subham astu sakābdāh 1588 । haraye namah govindāya namah ।) also agrees very closely with that of the latter. (It should be mentioned here that the colophon of its final chapter, which is almost the same as its final colophon, runs thus :- iti śrī-nārasimha-purāne ādye . ... na vāsudevāt param asti kimcit prathamo' dhyāyah ।).

This Ms lacks the same sections of the printed ed as the preceding Ms It also contains, like the preceding Ms, a chapter (viz., chap 47 on holy places in Ayodhyā) and about 50 lines (on the selection of leaves and flowers for Viṣṇu-worship) in chap. 52, which do not occur in the printed ed

Thus this Ms seems to have been derived from the same archetype as the preceding Ms The difference in the number of chapters in these two Mss is due to the fact that the story of Rāma-prādurbhāva is given in the preceding Ms in five chapters as against six (viz , chaps. 41-46) of the present one

(iii) Ms No. 284 A, which was procured from Nalāhāti in the district of Burdwan, consists of 121 folios and is written in Bengali scripts. It is dated Saka 1742 and contains 53 chapters, of which chaps. 44-53 are not numbered

It begins with the verses ' nārāyanam namaskrtya ', ' taptahātaka-keśāgra ' and ' nakha-mukha-vilikhita-diti-tanayorah' ' and ends thus —

imam stavam yah pathate sa mānavaḥ prāpnoti viṣnor amitātmakam hi tat ॥ iti śrī-narasmha-purāne dharmārtha-kāma-mokṣa-pradāyini param-brahma-svarūpini vaiṣnavāsta-saṣṭināmādhyāyah ॥

asya srī-rājasimhasya prakṛtyālingito hariḥ ।
rādhā-mohana-rayasya prīto bhavatu sarvadā ॥

yugma-śruty-asva-candrānkita-śakamite bhāskare taisa yāte natvālekhīn murāreh kajanu-yuga-samam pāda-yugmam surāreyam ।

śrī-rādhā-mohanākhya-ksitipa-naraharer nārasimham purāṇam gotrādevānvavāyaprabhavakrtamahāyatnasantāna āśu ॥

In this Ms. chap 53 consists of chaps 57 (verses 8-20) and 65 of the printed edition In verses 1-16 of chap. 53 of this Ms (which correspond to verses 8-20 of chap 57 of the printed ed.) king Sahasrānīka asks Mārkaṇḍeya to describe to him the duties of the four castes and orders of life (varnāśrama-dharma). Consequently, Mārkaṇḍeya begins to report what Hārīta, being requested by some sages to speak on 'Varnāśrama-dharma', 'Yoga-śāstra' and 'Viṣṇu-tattva' (cf bhagavan sarvvadharmmajña sarvva-dharmma-pravarttaka । varṇānāṃ āśramānam ca dharmmān prabruhi śāsvatān । samasād yoga-śāstram tu yam dhyātvā mucyate naraḥ । viṣṇu-tattvam muni-śreṣṭha tvam hi naḥ paramo guruḥ ।), said to them on these topics But in these verses Hārīta is found only to introduce his subject by briefly narrating the origin of the four castes and the place fit for their residence and to say nothing on Varnāśrama-dharma etc. On the other hand, in verses 17ff. of this chapter (which corresponds to chap 65 of the printed ed.) Sūta, being requested by Bharadvāja, names the 68 places sacred to Viṣṇu Hence it is sure that in the original Ms from which our present one was copied, verses 1-16 of chap 53 were followed by chapters on Varnāśrama-dharma, Yoga and Viṣṇu-tattva, i e by chaps 57 (verses 21-30-on the duties of Brāhmaṇas), 58-60 (on the duties of the Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras, as well as of the students, householders, forest-hermits and Yatis), 61 (on Yoga), 62 (on the Vedic procedure of Viṣṇu-worship) and 63 (verses 1-9 and 119b-122-on the popular method of Viṣṇu-worship) of the printed ed It is most probably due to the inadvertence of the scribe that these intervening chapters and verses have been omitted in our present Ms

As, like the other two Mss, it lacks the following sections of the printed ed, viz,

chap. 31, verses 1-97	—on the story of Dhruva,
chap 33, verses 15-85	—on the story of the Pāndavas' killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlaśiras,
chap. 40, verses 60b-61b, chaps. 41-43, chap. 44, verses 1-13	—on the story of Prahlāda,
chap. 54, verses 8-61	—on the characteristic evils of the Kali age,

we may assume that the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form (as found in chap 63, verses 10-119a of the printed ed) and the interlocution between Nārada and Puṇḍarīka on the glories of Nārāyana (as given in chap 64 of the printed ed.) were wanting in the original Ms from which our present one was copied.

(It should be mentioned here that the corresponding chapters of the Dacca University Mss on the one hand and the printed ed on the other, differ not only in readings but also occasionally in the numbers of verses. For instance, after verse 31 of chap. 5 the Dacca University Mss have 12 verses which are not found in the printed ed.)].

(8) R L. Mitra, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner*, pp 207-8, No. 452.

This Ms is written in Nāgara and consists of only 41 chapters (so far as their number, given by Mitra in connection with the description of their contents, shows). The corresponding chapters of this Ms and the printed ed. are the following :—

Ms		*Printed ed.*	*Ms*		*Printed ed*
Chaps 1-29	=	Chaps. 1-29 respectively.	Chap. 32	=	Chaps. 33 (verses 1-14); 34 (verses 2-55).
Chap. 30	=	Chaps. 30, 31 (verses 98-113)	Chap. 33	=	Chap. 35
Chap. 31	=	Chap. 32.	Chaps. 34-41	=	Chaps. 36-39, 40 (except verses 60b-61b); 44 (verses 14-43); 45-47

So this Ms, which ends after dealing with only a few of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu, is necessarily incomplete It lacks the stories of Dhruva, Prahlāda, and the Pāṇḍavas who killed the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlaśiras for carrying away Draupadī by force]

(9) P P S. Sastri, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Mahārājā Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library*, Tanjore, Vol. XV, pp. 7151-53, Nos. 10548-53.

[Of these Mss, the first (No. 10548) consists of 64 chapters and is written in Devanāgarī. It begins with the verse 'tapta-hāṭaka-keśāntarjvalat°' and ends with the verse 'yo nārasimham vapur āsthitah purā' Its colophon is as follows. iti śrīmannāra-simha-purāṇe ādye dharmārtha-kāma-mokṣa-pradāyini para-brahma-svarūpa-nirūpane catuhsaṣtitamo' dhyāyah. The contents of its different chapters are not given in the Catalogue

No information regarding the beginnings, ends and contents of the other Mss is given by Sastri]

(10) Chintaharan Chakravarti, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Vangiya Sāhitya Pariṣad*, Calcutta, p 72, No. 1432

[It contains chaps. 1-60 and is complete]

(11) Stein, *Jammu Catalogue*, p 202

[One of these two Mss is complete and is written in modern Kāśmīri scripts, while the other deals with Lakṣmī-nṛsimha-sahasra-nāma.]

(12) *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Sanskrit College Library, Benares*, pp 337 and 338.

(13) Haralal, *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Central Provinces and Berar*, pp 224 and 248.

(14) Lewis Rice, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Mysore and Coorg*, p 72

(15) Burnell, *Classified Index to the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Palace at Tanjore*, p 188

(16) Haraprasad Shastri, *Catalogue of Palm leaf and Selected Paper Manuscripts in the Durbar Library, Nepal*, p 19

[This Ms is written in Maithila scripts]

APPENDIX II

(A)

The Dacca University Mss have the following verses after verse 31 of chap. 5 of the printed edition :—

prītyām pulastya-bhāryāyām dattolis tat-suto'bhavat ।
tasya vai viśravah putras tat-putro rāvaṇādayah ॥
rākṣasā bahavah proktā laṅkāpura-nivāsinah ।
yeṣām vadhāya lokeśo viṣṇuh kṣīrodadhau purā ।
brahmādyaih prārthito devair avatāram ihākarot ॥
karddamaś cāmbarīśaś ca sahiṣṇuś ca suta-trayam ।
kṣamā tu suṣuve bhāryā pulahasya prajāpateh ॥
kratos tu sannatir bhāryā vālakhilyān asūyata ।
ṣaṣṭis tāni sahasrāṇi ṛṣīṇām ūrdhva-retasām ।
aṅguṣṭha-parva-mātrāṇām jvalad-bhāskara-tejasām ॥
pracetaso'tha satyāyām satyasandhādayah sutāh ।
jātās tat-putra-pautrās ca śataśo'tha sahasraśah ॥
ūrjāyām ca vaśiṣṭhasya saptājāyanta vai sutāh ।
rajogātrordhvabāhuś ca sabalaś cānaghas tathā ॥
sutapāh śukra ity ete sarve saptarṣayo'bhavan ॥
bhṛgoh khyātyām samutpannā lakṣmīr viṣṇu-parigrahah ।
tathā dhātṛ-vidhātārau khyātyām jātau sutau bhṛgoh ॥
āyatir niyatiś caiva meroh kanye suśobhane ।
dhātur vidhātus ca te bhārye tayor jātau sutāv ubhau ॥
prāṇaś caiva mṛkanduś ca mārkaṇḍeyo mṛkaṇḍutah ।
yena mṛtyur jito vipra purā nārāyaṇāśrayāt ।
tato vedaśirā jajñe prāṇasyāpi suto'bhavat ।
dyutimān iti vikhyātah sañjayas tat-suto'bhavat ॥
tato vaṁśo mahābhāga bhārgavo vistaram gatah ॥

See Mss No 284A (fol 8b-9b), 323 (fol. 9b-10a), and 2713 (fol. 7a-b).

Of the variations in readings in these Mss, the following are more important :—

Ms No. 2713 reads 'kapardha°' for 'karddama°' in line 6.
Ms No. 323 reads 'sumati°' for sannati°' in line 8.
Ms No 284A reads 'sandhyāyām' for 'satyāyām' in line 11;
Mss No. 323 and 2713 read 'satyasandhās trayah' for 'satyasandhādayah' in line 11;
Ms No. 284A reads 'savara°' for 'sabala°' in line 14.

(B)

After verse 7 of chap 57 of the printed edition, the Dacca University Mss have the following verses —

puspair aranya-sambhūtaih patrair vā giri-sambhavaih ।
aparyusita-niśchidraih proksitair jantu-varjitaih ॥
ātmārāmodbhavair vāpi puspaih sampūjayeddharim ।
puspa-jāti-viśesais tu bhavet punyam viśesatah ॥
tapah-śīla-gunopete pātre vedasya pārage ।
daśa datvā suvarnāni yat phalam labhate narah ।
tat phalam labhate martyo harau kusuma-dānatah ॥
drona-puspe tathaikasmin mādhavāya nivedite ।
daśa datvā suvarnāni yat phalam tadavāpnuyāt ॥
evam puspa-viśesena phalam tadadhikam nrpa ।
jñeyam puspāntarenaiva yathā syāt tan nibodha me ॥
drona-puspa-sahasrebhyah khādiram samviśisyate ।
khādirebhyah sahasrebhyah śamī-puspam viśisyate ॥
śamī-puspa-sahasrebhyo bilva-puspam viśisyate ।
bilva puspa-sahasrebhyo vaka-puspam viśisyate ॥
vaka-puspa-sahasrāddhi nandyāvartam viśisyate ।
nandyāvarta-sahasrebhyah karavīram viśisyate ॥
karavīra-sahasrebhyah śvetam tat puspam uttamam ।
karavīra-śveta puspāt palāśam puspam uttamam ॥
palāśa puspa-sahasrāddhi kuśa-puspam viśisyate ।
kuśa-puspa-sahasrāddhi vana mālā viśisyate ॥
vana mālā sahasrāddhi campakam puspam isyate ।
campakānām puspa-śatād aśokam puspam uttamam ॥
aśokānām sahasrāddhi samantī-puspam uttamam ।
samantī-puspa-sahasrāddhi kubja-puspam viśisyate ।
kubja-puspa-sahasrāt tu mālatī-puspam uttamam ।
mālatī-puspa-sahasrāddhi sandhyāraktam taduttamam ॥
sandhyārakta-sahasrāddhi tri-sandhyā-śvetam uttamam ।
tri-sandhyā-śveta-sahasrāt kunda-puspam viśisyate ॥
kunda-puspa sahasrāddhi śata-patram viśisyate ।
śatapatra-sahasrāddhi mallikā-puspam uttamam ॥
mallikā-puspa-sahasrāj jāti-puspam viśisyate ।
sarvāsām puspa-jātīnām jāti-puspāni cottamam ।
jāti-puspa-sahasrena yo mālām nityaśo dadet ।
visnave vidhivad bhaktyā tasya punya-phalam śrnu ॥

kalpa-koti-sahasrāni kalpa-koti-satāni ca ।
vased visnu-pure srīmān visnu-tulya-parakramah ॥
sesānām puspa-jātīnām yat phalam vidhi-coditam ।
tat-phalasyānusārena visnu-loke mahīyate ॥
patrāny api supuspāni hareh prīti-karāni ca ।
pravaksyāmi nrpa-srestha śrnusva gadato mama ॥
apāmārga-patram prathamam tasmad bhrngārakam param ।
tasmāt tu khādiram sresthaṁ tasmāt tu samī-patrakam ॥
durvā-patram tatah sresṭham tato'pi kusa-patrakam ।
tasmād āmalakam śrestham tato bilvasya patrakam ॥
bilva-patrād api hares tulasī-patram uttamam ॥
etesām tu yathā-labdhair patrair vā yo'rcayeddharim ।
sarva-pāpa vinirmukto visnu loke mahīyate ॥
evam hi rājan narasimha-murteh priyāni puspāni tavetarāni ।
etaiś ca nityam harim arcya bhaktyā naro viśuddho harim eva yāti ॥

See Mss Nos 284A (fol. 118a 119a), 323 (fol. 114a-115a), and 2713 (fol. 86b-87b)

The important differences in readings in these Mss are the following —

Ms No. 284A omits 'samī-puspam viśisyate । samī-puspa sahasrebhyo' in lines 13-14

Ms No 323 omits line 18 (karavīra-sahasrebhyah etc.).

Ms No 323 omits 'vanamāla viśisyate । vanamālā-sahasrāddhi' in lines 21-22 ;

for 'samantī°' in lines 24 and 25, Ms 284A (after marginal correction) reads 'sevantī°', and Ms No. 323 reads 'semantī°',

Ms No. 2713 omits lines 33 (sarvāsām puspa-jātīnām etc.)

Ms No. 2713 reads 'damanakam' for 'āmalakam' in line 45.

APPENDIX III

Verses quoted from the '*Narasiṃha-p*' or '*Nṛsiṃha-p.*'
or '*Nārasiṃha*' in

1 Aparārka's com on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti,* — *Narasiṃha-p*

p 79 = 58, 34^b–35^a

p 125 = 58, 58^b–59
Three lines from 'saṃdhyakarmāvasāne tu' are not found in the *Narasiṃha p*

p 131 = 58, 88^b–89
The verse 'dadyāt sarva grahebhya ca' is not found in the *Narasiṃha-p*

p 141 = 63, 3-4, 18, 5 and 63, 5-6

p. 153 = 58, 98^b–99^a, 100^a and 101^a

p 162 = 58, 11^b and 13^b

p 189 = 58, 109–110^a
The line 'niyamanam śavaṃ dṛṣṭvā', which is not found in the printed ed. of the *Narasiṃha-p*, occurs in the Dacca University Ms No 2713, fol. 92^a (chap 55)

p. 951 = 58, 36
The verses 'agārād abhiniṣkrāntaḥ' and 'jagadi-viṣayāsaṅga' are not found in the *Narasiṃha-p.*

Narasiṃha-p

p 965 = 60, 12–15, 17^a–e, 16 and 17^f–h
The verses 'udghātayec ca kavacam and 'caturaṅgulaiḥ prakṣālya' and the line 'yatidharmarataḥ', which are not found in the printed ed, occur in chap 57 of the Dacca University Ms No 2713 (fol 93^a)

2 *Dānasāgara* of Vallalasena

fol. 20^b = 58, 51^b–52^a

" 24^b = 58, 78^b–82

" 124^b = 30, 36.
Three lines from 'kapilām lakṣaṇopetām' do not occur in the *Narasiṃha-p*

" 130^a = 30, 36

" 137^b = 30, 33^b

" 168^b = 30, 35.

" 174^{a-b} = 34 50^a, 49^a, etc
Many verses are not found in the *Narasiṃha-p*

" 180^b = 30, 34^a.

" 223^a = 30, 37^b

" 232^b = 30, 40^b.

Narasimha-p

fol. 276^b = 30 32

„ 292^b (twice) = 34, 39^a and 39^c, 34, 37^b–38

The line 'gavām sahasra-dānena' which is not found in the printed ed., occurs in the Dacca University Mss Nos. 284A (fol 57^b), 123 (fol 51^a) and 2713 (fol. 44^a)

3 *Smṛti-candrikā* of Devanabhatta,

I, p 178 = 58, 34^b

II, pp. 341–2 = 30, 12

p. 353 = 58, 58^b–59^a

The lines 'upāsya paścimām saṃdhyam' and 'gayatrīm abhyaset tavat' are not found in the *Narasimha-p*

p 485 = 58, 65.

p 488 —This verse occurs in chap 55 of the Dacca University Ms No. 2713 (fol. 90^b).

p 528 = 58, 91^b–93^a

p. 531 = 58, 92^b–93^a.

p. 540 = 34, 7

pp. 540–1 = 34, 17^b–18^a

pp. 541–2 —These 13 verses, which are not found in the printed ed, occur in the Dacca University Mss. See Appendix II (B).

Narasimha-p.

p. 548 — Given in foot-note 2 on p. 103 of the printed ed.

p. 561 = 58 93.

4 *Madana-pārijāta* of Madanapala,

p 298 = 58, 91^b–93^a.

pp 301–2 —These 16 verses occur in the Dacca University Mss. See Appendix II (B)

Some of these verses resemble *Nar* 34, 18^b, 21, 23^b–24^a and 27^b.

5 *Kṛtyacāra* of Srīdatta Upadhyāya (Dacca University Ms No 4339),

fol 6^b–7^a — This verse occurs in chap. 55 of the Dacca University Ms No 2713 (fol. 90^b)

„ 13^b (twice) = 58, 46^b–47.

(The line 'tintanī venuprstham ca' is not found in the *Narasimha-p*)

58, 49^a

fol 14^b = 58, 50^b–52^a.

„ 15^a = 58, 58^b–59^a.

„ 28^b = 58, 72^b-73

„ 37^b–38^a = 58, 77, 85^b and 87–88^a.

Narasimha-p

fol. 46^a — refers to 58, 88–91.
„ 58^b = 28, 34^b–35^a.
„ 60^b (twice) = 32, 18, 58, 91^b–93
„ 67^a = 58, 98^b–99^a, 100^a and 101^a

6 *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* of Hemādri,
I, pp 164–165 = 30, 27^b–36^a and 39–41^a
p. 165 = 30, 43^b–44^a
II, i, pp. 510–512 = 26, 2–20.
II, ii, p 14 = 67, 10–11.
p 521 = 67, 8
III, i, p. 890 = 58, 65
p 897 — This verse occurs in chap 55 of the Dacca University Ms No. 2713 (fol. 90^b).
III, ii, p 759 = 58, 109–110^a.

7 Mādhavācārya's com on the *Parāśara-smṛti*,
I, i, p 261 = 58, 88^b–89
pp 303–5 = 58, 78^b–82.
The verses 'uttamam mānasam japyam' and 'vācikasyaikamekam syād' are not found in the *Narasimha-p*.
p 364 = 58, 92^b–93^a.
p. 378 = 58, 93
pp. 406–7 = 58, 98^b–99^a.
p. 408 = 58, 100–101^a.
I, ii, p. 149 = 58, 36

Narasimha-p.

p 156 = 60, 2–4.
p 192 = 60, 13^b–14, 17d–e, 16 and 17f–g.
The lines 'caturangulen', 'sarva-vyañjana-samyuktam' and 'yatei dharma-ratah' are not found in the *Narasimha-p*

8 *Dīpa-kalikā* of Śūlapāṇi (Dacca University Ms No 602),
fol 22^a = 58, 11^b and 13^b

9 *Tīrtha-cintāmaṇi* of Vācaspati-miśra,
p 279 = 65 23^b 24^a

10 *Nityācāra-paddhati* of Vidyākara Vajapeyin,
p 32 = 8 40
p 61 (twice) = 58, 51^b 58 50^b–51^a
p. 87 — cf 58, 67^b and 71^b
p. 313 = 58, 89
pp 385–6 = 15, 8
p. 505 = 63, 3^a
p 511 = 63, 2

11 *Kriyā-tattvārṇava* of Śrīnāthācārya-cūḍāmaṇi (Dacca University Ms No. 49),
fol. 81^a = 58, 72^b–73^a.
„ 83^a = 58, 13^b.

12 ***Varṣa-kaumudī*** ***Narasiṁha-p*** of Govindānanda,

p. 147 = 62, 6.

p. 168 —These verses occur in the Dacca University Mss See Appendix II (B) The line 'viṣṇave vidhivat' and 'kalpa-koṭisahasrāṇi' also tally with *Nar.* 34, 27^b and 21^b respectively.

p. 171 = 34, 24^b–25^a.

p. 174 = 62, 14^a.

p. 178 = Given in foot-note on p. 103 of the *Narasiṁha-p*, The verse 'urasā sirasā' is not found in the *Narasiṁha-p.*

p. 199 = 62, 7^b–8^a.

pp. 200–201 = 62, 4, 17 and 8^b–15^a.

p. 251 = 58, 109^b–110.

p. 496 = 30, 32.

p. 501 = 58, 109^a–110^a.

p. 542 = 67, 8.

pp. 569–70 = 58, 11^b and 13^b.

13 ***Śuddhi-kaumudī*** of Govindānanda,

p. 313 = 53, 72^b–73^a,

p. 342 — cf. 58, 73–76.

14 ***Śrāddha-kaumudī*** of Govindānanda,

p. 146 = 58, 72^b–73^a,

15 ***Dāna-kaumudī*** ***Narasiṁha-p.*** of Govindānanda,

p. 51 = 30, 37^b,

16 *Smṛti-tattva* of Raghunandana,

I, p 21 — cf 62, 10.

p. 39 = 58, 109–110^a.

p 110 = 67, 7

p 146 = 67, 13–14 and 15.

p. 342 (thrice) = 58, 48^b–49^a, 47–48^a and 50^b–52^a The line 'tintiḍī etc.' is not found in the *Narasiṁha-p.*

p 364 = 58, 72^b–73^a.

p 391 = 58, 78^b–82

p 394 (twice) = 58, 91^b–92^a. Three lines from 'arghyam dadyāt tu sūryāya' are not found in the *Narasiṁha-p.*

p. 396 = 33, 13–14. The verse 'tato gṛhārcanam kuryāt' is not found in the *Narasiṁha-p.*

p 408 = 63, 3 and 5^{a-b}: 18, 5. The verse 'dhyātvā praṇava-pūrvam tu' is not found in the *Narasiṁha-p.*

	Narasiṃha-p.
p. 409	= 62, 14ᵃ, 8, 22 62, 10 The line ' sugandha-sumano dhūpa ' is not found in the *Narasiṃha-p.*
p 410	—These two lines occur in the Dacca University Mss See Appendix II (B)
p 411 (twice)	= 34, 18ᵇ–20. —The verse ' samī-patra-sahasrebh yah ', which is not found in the printed ed, occur in the Dacca University Mss. See Appendix II (B)
pp 417–8	= 28, 34ᵇ-35ᵃ The verse ' ahany ahani yo martyo ' is not found in the *Narasiṃha-p*
p 419	= 58, 93 —The verses ' apañca bhasahasrāpi ' and ' snānam dānam japah srāddham ' are not found in the *Narasiṃha-p.*
p 456	= 66, 45
p 743	= 67, 13-15
II, p 59	= 31, 12-13.
p. 60	= 58 48ᵇ-49, 62, 14ᵃ

	Narasiṃha-p.
p. 61	= 32, 19.
p 66	= 34, 18ᵇ–20. —The verse ' aparyusitaniśchidraih ' is found in the Dacca University Mss See Appendix II (B) The verse ' ketakī-patra-puspam ca ' is not found in the *Narasiṃha-p*
pp 72–73	= 18, 3 18, 5 and 8ᵃ–ᵇ. The verses ' sarva-vedānta-sārārtha " and ' yasya yāvāmś ca visvāsah are not found in the *Narasiṃha-p*
p 76	= 28, 34ᵇ–35ᵃ The verse ' urasā śirasā drstyā ' is not found in the *Narasiṃha-p*
p 84	= 66, 45.
p 284	= 30, 29–30ᵃ.
p. 508	= 32, 13–14 and 19ᵇ–20.
p 511	= 34, 11. —The line ' brahma-kūrca-vidhānena ' is given in foot-note 3 on p. 101 of the printed ed. 62, 14ᵃ
p 650	= 62, 14ᵃ,

		Narasimha-p.
17	*Durga-pūjā-tattva* of Raghunandana,	
	p 16	= 62, 14^{a}.
18	*Haribhakti-vilāsa* of Gopālabhatta,	
	p 22	= 18, 33.
	p. 142	= 66, 45.
	p 152	= 58 92^{b}-93^{a}
	p. 155	= 33, 14. The verse 'sammārjanam yah kurute' is not found in the *Narasimha-p.*
	p. 159	= 34, 13
	p 287	= 34, 4
	p 292	= 34, 5.
	p 297	= 34, 6-9^{a}. The verse 'duhsvapna-śamanam jñeyam ' and the line ' loka-mitrāny avāpnoti' are not found in the *Narasimha-p.*
	p. 298	= 34, 12.
	pp 300-1	= 34, 2-3, 6, 14^{c}-15^{a} and 14^{a-b}.
	p. 314	= 34, 16^{b}-17^{a}.
	p. 318	= 34^{a}, 38^{a-d}.
	p. 326	—These three lines, which are not found in the printed ed., occur in the Dacca University Ms -See Appendix II (B).
	p. 330	= 34, 18^{b} -19^{a} and 20 *Narasimha-p.* —The three lines ' tapah-śīla-gunopete ' etc and the verse ' evam hi rājan ' occur in the Dacca University Mss.—See Appendix II (B).
	p. 331	—These five lines, though not found in the printed ed., occur in the Dacca University Mss.—See Appendix II (B).
	pp. 331-2	—These lines occur in the Dacca University Mss —See Appendix II (B)
	p. 354	—These lines occur in the Dacca University Mss.—See Appendix II (B)
	p 377	= 34, 24^{b}-26
	p. 382	= 34, 27-28.
	p 398	= 34, 29-30.
	p 403	= 34, 3 (except 31^{c}).
	p. 408	= 34, 34^{d}-37^{a}
	p 423	= 34, 34^{b-c}.
	p 426	—This verse is given in foot note 2 on p. 103 of the printed ed.
	p 429	= 8, 45.
	p. 432	= 34, 32-33^{a}.
	p. 441	= 28, 34^{b}-35^{a}. The verse ' krsnasya paritosepsuh ' is not found in the *Narasimha-p.*

	Narasimha-p.
p 544	= 9, 2-3 and 5
p. 621	= 54, 39ᵉ and 39

The lines 'asvamedhasya yajñasya' and 'gavām sahasra-dānasya' are not found in the printed ed

p 639	= 32, 18-19, 8, 21-23.
p 663	= 8, 31.
p. 688	= 8, 27
p. 728	= 8, 29
p 1099	= 58, 78ᵇ-82.
p, 1117	= 32, 13
p 1175	= 32, 14, 15 and 20

The verse 'sakāmo narasimhasya' is not found in the *Nara-simha-p*

p 1290	= 32, 12.

19 *Nityācāra-pradipa* of Narasimha Vājapeyin,

p 187	= 58, 80-82 and 79ᵇ
p. 238	= 8, 40
p. 261	— This verse occurs in chap. 55 of the Dacca University Ms. No 2713 (fol. 90ᵇ)
p 283	= 58, 47.

The line 'tintidī venu-pṛṣṭham ca' is not found in the *Narasimha-p.*

p. 286	= 58, 50ᵇ-52ᵃ
p. 287	= 58, 51ᵇ.
p. 310	— This verse

Narasimha-p.

occurs in chap. 55 of the Dacca University Ms No. 2713 (fol 90ᵇ)

p. 365	= 58, 77
p 387	= 58, 88.
p. 496	= 7, 63-70 and 74ᵃ
p. 556	= 33, 13-14, 34, 2-3
p 557	= 34, 34ᵈ-35 and 37ᵃ.
pp 558-560	= 34, 12, 6-11 and 13-16ᵃ.

The line 'brahma-kūrca-vidhānena' is given in foot-note 3 on p. 101 of the printed ed.

Eight lines from 'gāya-tryā caiva gomūtram' to 'dadhni vāyuh sadā devah' are not found in the *Narasimha-p.*

p. 599	= 28, 24ᵇ-35ᵃ.

Also refers to the contents of chap. 28 of the *Narasimha-p.*

p. 607	= 34, 17ᵇ-18ᵃ.
p. 615	—These three verses occur in the Dacca University Mss. See Appendix II (B).
p. 616	— The verses 'drona-puspe' and 'etesām ca' occur in the Dacca University Mss See Appendix II (B).

	Narasimha-p.
	There is also reference to the contents of some of the verses given in Appendix II (B).
p 617	= 34, 18^{b}-19^{a} and 20 The line 'etaiś ca nityam' is not found in the *Narasimha-p.*
p. 644	= 34, 24^{b}-26
p. 649	= 34, 27-28.
p 665	= 34, 29-30
pp 676-7	= 34, 31^{a}-e
p. 697	= 34, 16^{b}-17^{a}, 37^{b}-38 and 39^{b}-e. —The last verse is not found in the *Narasimha-p*
p 729	= 63, 6-8^{b} and 5^{b}

20 *Kālasāra* of Gadādhara,

p. 323	—This line, which is not found in the printed ed, occurs in chap 55 of the Dacca University Ms No. 2713 (fol 92^{a}).

	Narasimha-p.
p 507	= 58, 50^{b}-51^{a}

21 *Vidhāna-pārijāta* of Anantabhaṭṭa,

I, pp. 592-6	= 34, 49^{a}, 49^{b}-51^{a}, 44^{a}, 48, 44^{b}-45^{a}, 46-47, 45^{b}, 51^{b}-54, and 55. 35, 1-5^{a} and 6^{b}-25

The verses 'hasantīm pratimām dṛṣṭvā' and 'tathā mahājvaragraste', which are not found in the printed ed., occur in the Dacca University Mss Nos 284A (fol 58^{a}), 323 (fol 51^{b}, the line 'prasveda-yuktām' is not found in this Ms), and 2713 (fol 44^{b}).

The line 'bhaktyā prapūjayet' is not found in the *Narasimha-p.*

APPENDIX IV

The quotations made from the '*Narasimha-p*' (or '*Nṛsiṁha-p.*' or '*Nārasiṁha*') in the following works are not found in the present *Narasiṁha-p*

(1) *Dānasāgara*, fol 173b

(2) *Madana-pārijāta*, p 211.

(3) *Caturvarga-cintāmani*, II, ii, pp 41-4?, 375, 376-7 (?), 381-2. III, i, pp 245, 432-3, 680, 702-3, 720, 738, 929-930. III, ii, pp 505, 673, 852

(4) *Dipa-kalikā* (Dacca University Ms No 602), fol 97b.

(5) *Śrāddha-viveka* (Dacca University Ms No 151A), fol 2a

(6) *Vrata-kāla-viveka* (Dacca University Ms No 1578c) fol. 3b.

(7) *Tithi-viveka* (Dacca University Ms No 403D), fol. 4b

(8) *Nityācāra-paddhati*, pp. 495, 505-6, 530

(9) *Śrāddha-kaumudī*, p. 100

(10) *Smṛti-tattva*, I, pp 351, 414, 415, 762, 827, II, p. 628

(11) *Haribhakti-vilāsa* pp. 156, 431, 660 710.

(12) *Nityācāra-pradīpa*, pp 181, 512

(13) *Kālasāra*, p 145.

(14) *Vidhāna-pārijāta*, I, p. 451

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF INDIAN PLANTS— HISTORY OF CAṆAKA (GRAM) AS FOOD FOR HORSES—BETWEEN C. A. D. 800 AND 1870 TOGETHER WITH SOME NOTES ON THE IMPORT OF FOREIGN HORSES INTO INDIA IN ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL TIMES

BY

P K. GODE

A friend of mine in the Bombay Agricultural Department, who was interested in the history of several Indian crops, once asked me if I could study the history of *Caṇaka* or *gram* used by men and horses in India to-day. I promised him to write some paper on *Caṇaka* and its antiquity on the strength of Indian sources I put a counter-question to my friend *Can you tell me when Caṇaka or gram came to be used as food for horses?* My friend could not answer this question for want of evidence. I, therefore, propose to record in this paper some evidence which throws some light on this question from the Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit sources available to me.

Yule and Burnell have recorded some useful information on *Gram* or *Canaka* in the *Hobson-Jobson*, London, 1903, pp. 392–393 as follows :—

GRAM S.—This word is properly the Portuguese *grão* i. e. 'grain' but it has been specially appropriated to that kind of vetch (*cicer arietinum*, L.) which is the most general grain—(rather pulse-) food for horses all over India, called in H. *Chana* It is the Ital *cece*, Fr. *pois chiche*, Eng. *chick-pea* or Egypt. *pea* much used in France and S. Europe. This specific application of *grão* is also Portuguese as appears from Bluteau. The word *gram* is in some parts of India applied to other kinds of pulse, and then this application of it is recognized by qualifying it as *Bengal gram.* (See remarks under CALAVANCE). The plant exudes oxalate of potash, and to walk through a gram-field in a wet morning is destructive to shoe-leather. The natives collect the acid."

The following dated usages of the word GRAM are then recorded in the *Hobson-Jobson* :—

A. D. 1513—" And for the *food of these horses* (exported from the Persian Gulf) the factor supplied grãos"

—*Albuquerque, Cartas* p 200
Letter of December 4.

A. D. 1554— (Describing Vijayanagar)—" There the *food* of *horses* and *elephants* consists of *grãos*, rice and other vegetables cooked with *jagra*, which is palm-tree sugar, as there is *no barley in that country* "

—*Castanheda*, Bk. ii, Ch. 16

C A. D. 1610—" They give them also a certain *grain* like lentils "

—*Pyrard de Laval*. Hak. Soc. ii, 79.

A. D. 1702—" . ...he confessing before us that their allowance three times a week is but a quart of rice and *gram* together for five men a day, but promises that for the future it shall be rectified "

—In *Wheeler*, ii, 10.

A. D. 1776—" ......Lentils......*gram*......mustard seed "

—*Halhed's Code*, p. 8 (Pt. ii).

A D 1789—' *gram*, a small kind of pulse, universally used instead of oats "

—*Munroe's Narrative*, 85.

A. D. 1793—" . *gram* which it is not customary to give to bullocks in the Carnatic "

—*Dirrom's Narrative*, 97.

A. D 1804—" The *gram* alone for the four regiments with me has in some months cost 50,000 pagodas "

—*Wellington*, iii, 71

A. D. 1865—" But they had come at a wrong season, *gram* was dear, and prices low and the sale concluded in a dead loss "

—*Palgrave's Arabia*, 290.

Gram-fed—adj Properly the distinctive description of mutton and beef fattened upon *gram* which used to be the pride of Bengal. But applied figuratively to any 'pampered creature'.

in the article on CALAVANCE (*Hobson-Jobson*, p. 145) we are told that the word *Calavance* comes from the Span. *grabanzos*, which De Candolle mentions as Castilian for '*pois chiche*' or *cicer arietinum* (= gram)

The above usages of *gram* as food for horses and men, take its history upto *A. D. 1513.* I shall now trace this history backward from A. D 1513.

Narahari in his medical glossary called the *Rājanighaṇṭu*[1] composed in Kashmir C *A D. 1450*[2] refers to चणक or gram as "वाजिभक्ष" (food for horses) in the following verse:—

" चणस्तु हरिमन्थः स्यात् सुगन्धः कृष्णकञ्चुकः ।
बालभोज्यो वाजिभक्षश्चणकः कञ्चुकी च सः ॥ "

In the two special treatises on horses, which are definitely earlier than Narahari's *Rājanighaṇṭu* we get some references to *Canaka* as food for horses. These treatises are (1) अश्ववैद्यक[3] of महासामन्त जयदत्त and (2) अश्वचिकित्सित[4] of नकुल.

References to चणक in the अश्ववैद्यक of जयदत्त are as follows -

Page 106 (chap. 11 — द्रव्यमात्रा विवरणम्)

" चणकाश्चैव माषाश्च ये चान्ये व्रीहयस्तथा ।
यवार्द्धेन प्रयोक्तव्या देशसात्म्येन खादने ॥ ९ ॥ "

Here चणक or gram is definitely prescribed for the regimen of horses along with यव,[5] माष, and व्रीहि The editor in explaining the above observes :-

---

[1] Quoted on p, 212 of अष्टाङ्गहृदयकोश by K. M, Vaidya, Trichur, 1936.

[2] *Hobson Jobson* (p 476) refers to *Kitchery* (खिचडी) as food for horses — " *c 1475* Horses are fed on *pease*, also on *Kichris*, boiled with sugar and oil etc " — *Abdurrazak* in India in 15th Century, p. 10 -- Does " pease " here mean *chick-peas* or चणक ?

[3] Edited by Umeśa Chandra Gupta in *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta, 1886, pages 335. A Glossary of *Indian Drugs* mentioned by Jayadatta, together with their *Bengali*, *Hindi* and *Latin* synonyms, is given by the Editor at the end of this edition In this glossary अहिफेन or *opium* is mentioned on p. 3.

[4] Edited by Umeśa Chandra Gupta, Bib Indica, 1887 pages 63.

[5] हेमचन्द्र (*A. D. 1088-1172*) in his lexicon अभिधानचिन्तामणि (भूमिकाण्ड, 236) mentions यव as the favourite of horses — " यवो हयप्रियः " (Comm. " हयानां प्रियः हयप्रियः "). He refers to चणक. in verse 237 as " चणको हरिमन्थकः " and explains " चणति हूयमानः चणकः " and " हरिभिः मथ्यते हरिमन्थकः " *Amarakośa* mentions पारसीक horses and हरिमन्थक (= चणक).

"वाजिनां भोजनार्थे यवादीनां एवं मात्राः एकदिने यवस्य आढक-चतुष्टयं। चणकमाषव्रीह्यादीनां आढकद्वयं मात्रा। मुद्गस्य च प्रस्थत्रयं। यत्र यत्र भोजने स्नेहव्यवस्था सर्वत्रैव स्नेहस्य कुडवत्रयं लवणस्य कुडवो देयः।"

Then the editor quotes the following verse from अग्निपुराण :—

"चणकव्रीहिमौद्गानि कलायं वापि दापयेत्।
अहोरात्रेणचार्द्धस्य यवसस्य तुला दश॥
अष्टौ शुष्कस्य दातव्याश्चतस्रोऽथ बुषस्य वा।"

इति अग्निपुराणम्। एव माषभोजनेऽपि माषस्य २ प्रस्था.। तैलस्य २ कुडवाः। लवणस्य च कुडवः॥"

Chapter 13 deals with the treatment of horses in different seasons (सर्व-ऋतु-उपचार) Special attention is given to the food[1] of the horses in these seasons. Among articles of food for the autumn (शरत्) we find मांसयूष (meat-broth) and for the winter (हेमन्त) some wine (वारुणी) also. Wine (मदिरा) is also prescribed for the spring (वसन्त). In *chapter* 22 dealing with treatment of horses for removing fatigue (श्रान्तोपचार) मांस रस or flesh juice is prescribed along with यव (barley). In *chapter* 40 dealing with the treatment of horses in fever (ज्वरविवरण) मांसरस-ओदन or rice boiled with flesh juice is prescribed. *Chapter* 66 (रसोनकल्प) prescribes the several uses of garlic in 22 verses Garlic is said to be specially beneficial to old horses (वृद्धेषु च विशेषेण रसोनञ्च प्रदापयेत्) References to चणक as food for horses in the अश्वचिकित्सित of नकुल are as follows :—

Page 39— *chapter* 11 (ऋतुचर्या) prescribes the use of gram (चणक) in the absence of यव in the following verse -

"यवोत्थ यवस दद्यादेकविंशत्यहानि च।
यवाऽभावेऽथ चणकान् दद्यादार्द्रतरान् सदा॥१०॥"

नकुल praises why much the use of यव for feeding the horses as follows :-

"देवतानां यथा विष्णुर्ब्रह्मा वेदविदां वरः।
नदीनाञ्च यथा गङ्गा तथा श्रेष्ठा यवा हये॥१४॥"

[1] Cf *Ain-i-Akbari* (A D 1590) (Blochmann) Vol. I (1873)—*Ain 49* on Imperial Horse Stables—The regimen includes *peas, grain, flour, sugar, fresh grass, ghee, hay, molasses, salt, Brown sugar, green oats* for regular horses—Regimen for foals includes *milk of Cows*.

यव had been the sustainer of the Aryans from Vedic times and consequently नकुल lavishes so much praise on it. The Vedic Aryans[1] may have used यव for their horses. नकुल and जयदत्त prescribe यव as food for horses. यवस is prescribed by नकुल for horses. Keith in his *Vedic Index* (Vol. II, p. 117) states that "यवस in the Ṛgveda and later denotes the 'grass' on which animals feed and which is burnt by the forest fire."

Page 42— नकुल continues his praise of यव in the following lines :—

" परीक्षाग्नौ यथा हेम्नः स्नेहस्य च प्रतिक्रिया ।
हयजीवस्य तद्वच्च परीक्षा यवभक्षणे ।। ३२ ॥
यथा सायांत्रिक' पार गत्वोच्चैः स्वस्थता व्रजेत् ।
तद्वत् यवाशनोत्तीर्णाः छुब्धदेहा हयोत्तमाः ॥ ३३ ॥

Page 43— When नकुल wrote his treatise चणक had attained quite an important status in the regimen of the horses. In fact it was considered as the *second best* grain for horses (next to यव) as will be seen from the following verse—

" यवाऽभावेऽथ चणका धान्यमन्यतमं परम् । "
" एते पुष्टिगुणाः प्रोक्ताश्चणकाहारजा हये । "

In the detailed regimen of horses Kautilya mentions numerous items except चणक. I am, therefore, inclined to suggest that चणक was not used as food for horses in Kauṭilya's time. The question now arises as regards the exact time when चणक came to be used as food for horses or "वाजिभक्ष". It appears that when नकुल wrote his treatise the use of चणक was getting into vogue as food for horses. We must now find references to चणक as food for horses in sources earlier than the time of जयदत्त and नकुल, the authors of

[1] In the *Vedic Index* (Vol I —"अश्व," Keith and Macdonell do not refer to the use of यव for horses. In the *Arthaśāstra* Kautilya refers to यव in the regimen for horses in his chapter on अश्वाध्यक्ष (Book II chap. 30) p. 147 of Eng. Trans. by Shamsastry, 1929

" For the best horse (the diet shall be) two *dronas* of any one of the grains, rice (शालि, व्रीहि), barley (यव), panic seeds (प्रियङ्गु) soaked or cooked, *mudga* (Phaseolus Mungo), or *Māṣa* (Phaseolus Radiatus ;one *prastha* of oil, 5 *palas* of salt, 50 *palas* of flesh, one *āḍhaka* of broth (*rasa*), or two *āḍhakas* of curd, 5 *palas* of sugar (Kṣāra), to make their diet relishing one *prastha* of *surā* liquor or two *prasthas* of milk. "

There is no reference to चणक in the *Word-Index* to the *Arthaśāstra*.

अश्ववैद्यक and अश्वचिकित्सित respectively But what is the time of जयदत्त and नकुल? In connection with this question the following data may be recorded :—

(1) In the Vedic times "Horses from the Indus were of special value, as also horses from Sarasvatī (see p. 43 of *Vedic Index* (Keith and Macdonell)

(2) The *Arthaśāstra* of Kautilya (p. 148 of Eng. Trans., 1929) mentions the following varieties of horses :—

> (i) *Kāmboja*, (ii) *Sindhu*, (iii) *Aratta* and (iv) *Vanāyu*— These are the *best* breeds and (v) *Bāhlika*, (vi) *Pāpeya*, (vii) *Sauvīra* and (viii) *Taitala* are breeds of *middle* quality

(3) जयदत्त in chap. VI of his अश्ववैद्यक mentions the following kinds of horses —

Best kinds — (1) ताजिक (Arabian horses)
(2) पारसिक (Persian)
(3) केक्काण or कोङ्कण

Other kinds are (4) तुरी जाता or तुरुष्का, (5) कीरा, (6) खुरुष्टा, (7) भाण्डजाः, (8) पार्श्वता, (9) सैन्धवा, (10) सारस्वता, (11) सम्भला, (12) कुशा, (13) जटदेशोद्भवा, (14) प्राग्दक्षिणोद्भवा, (15) पञ्चदेशोद्भवा, (16) दाक्षिणात्याः, (17) पूर्वदेशसमुद्भवा etc

(4) नकुल in chap II of his अश्वचिकित्सित mentions the following kinds of horses :—

Best kinds — (1) ताजिका (Arabian)
(2) खुरशाणा (Khorasān)
(3) उत्तरा (variant तुषारा)

Other kinds — (4) गोजिकाणा, (5) केकाणा, (6) प्रोहाहारा (variant पोपहारा.), (7) भाण्डजाः, (8) गजशूलाः, (9) गोह्वराः, (10) शावरा, (11) सिन्धुपारा..

The above list of numerous kinds of horses known to Indians in the time of जयदत्त and नकुल contains a eulogy of ताजिक (Arabian), पारसिक (Persian) and some other foreign breeds of horses like तुरुष्क (Turkish) and खुरशाण (Khorasān) varieties. This popularity of *Persian Turkish*, *Khorasan*, *Arabian* and other foreign breeds clearly shows that the importation of foreign horses into India was an established feature of foreign commerce with India at the time when जयदत्त and नकुल composed their treatises on horses.

(5) *Morco Polo* in his *Travels* [1] (A. D. 1298) records some references to horses of different countries as follows :—

Page 28— Horses in Turkomania. [2] Morco Polo observes :—

" There is here an excellent breed of horses which has the appellation of *Turki* and fine mules which are sold at high prices." The Turki breed of horses is esteemed throughout the East for spirit and hardiness. (Compare तुरुष्क horses mentioned by जयदत्त).

Page 50—Horses in Persia

" The country is distinguished for its excellent breed of horses many of which are carried for sale to India and bring high prices not less in general than two hundred livres tournois. [3]

" The traders of these parts convey the horses to Kisi to Ormus, and to other places on the coast of the Indian sea, where they are *purchased by those who carry them to India.* In consequence, however, of the greater heat of that country, they do not last many years, being natives of a temperate climate. "

Page 134—Horses of Tartars fed on grass alone.

The Tartars " are capable of supporting every kind of privation, and when there is a necessity for it can live for a month on the milk of their mares and upon such wild animals as they may chance to catch. Their horses are fed upon grass alone and do not require barley or other grain (contrast the Indian regimen for horses consisting of यव, चणक and मांसयूष mentioned in the अश्ववैद्यक and अश्वचिकित्सित of जयदत्त and नकुल and the rich diet for horses given by the *Arthaśāstra* in its chapter on अश्वाध्यक्ष).

[1] Ed by Thomas Wright, London, 1901.

[2] "Turkomania" then comprised the possessions of the great Seljuk dynasty in Asia Minor, says the Editor, Mr. Wright.

[3] Wright observes — The excellence of the *Persian horses*, for which they may perhaps be indebted to the *mixture of the Arabian and Turki* breed, is well known A detailed account of their qualities is given by Chardin (tom ii, chap. viii, p 25, 4 to) , and also by Malcolm (*Hist. of Persia* Vol ii, p. 516) As the *livre tournois*, in the 14th cent was at the proportionate value of 25 to 1 livre of the present times, it follows that, *the price at which the Persian horses sold in India* was from *1500 to 2000* rupees. "

Cf. Vincent Smith (*History of India*, Oxford, 1914, p. 426)—King Pulakeśin II of the Deccan sent an embassy to Khusru II of Persia in *A. D. 625.* Khusru sent a return embassy to Pulakeśin. A picture of this return embassy is found on an Ajanta fresco painting in Cave No. 1.

"The men are habituated to remain on horse-back during two days and two nights, without dismounting, sleeping in that situation whilst their horses graze"

Page 262—Horses bred in Karaian[1]

—'The best horses are bred in this province', (Wright observes :- "This is probably the same breed as the *tangun* or *tanyan* horses of lower Tibet, carried from thence for sale to Hindustan. The people of Būtan informed Major Rennell that they brought their *tanyans* thirty-five days journey to the frontier" (cf. जयदत्त mentions टङ्कण breed ·—" वर्तुलश्चापि ह्रस्वश्च टङ्कणः परिकीर्तितः"

Page 266— Horses bred in Karazan

"In this province the horses are of a large size and whilst young are carried for *Sale to India*. It is the practice to deprive them of one joint of the tail, in order to prevent them from lashing it from side to side, and to occasion its remaining pendant, as the whisking it about, in riding, appears to them a vile habit".[2]

Page 386— No horses are bred in Maabar but they are imported form Arabia

—"No horses being bred in this country the king and his three royal brothers expend large sums of money annually in the purchase of them from merchants of *Ormus*, *Dufar*, *Pecher* and Adem etc."

—"The climate of the province is unfavourable[3] to the race of horses."

---

[1] Wright states that *Karaian* is generally understood to be north-western part of *yun-nan* Dr F. Buchanan (*Asiatic Researches*, Vol, iv, p. 228) writes this word as *Kaiayn*. He also speaks of *Ka-Kiayn* a wild people on the frontiers of China जयदत्त mentions a breed of horses of the name केक्काण (variants कांङ्काण, केक्कन, केक्कण,). नकुल also mentions the केक्काण breed Has केक्काण or its phonetic variants any connection with *Ka-Kiayn* people on the frontiers of China, mentioned by Buchanan ?

[2] Wright states that Karazan is another province of Yun-nan—It appears that the practice of docking the tails of horses by separating one or more of the vertebrae, which has become so common in England existed many hundred years ago amongst the people of Yun-nan, in the remotest part of China—Chinese pronunciation of *Karazan* would be *Ka-la-Shan*.

[3] Wright observes — "Even at the present day there is no breed of horses in the Southern part of the peninsula, and all the cavalry employed

(*continued on the next page*)

—" **For food they give them flesh dressed with rice, and other prepared meats, the country not producing any grain besides rice.** "

Page 420—Horses exported to India from Kanan or Tana.

—" They likewise take on board a number to horses fo be carried for *sale to different parts of India.*"[1]

Page 439—Horses from Aden exported to India,

" In this port of Aden, likewise, the merchants ship a greater number of *Arabian horses*, which they carry for ***sale** to all the kingdoms and islands of India*, obtaining high prices for them and making *large profits* " (cf. the statement of जयदत्त and नकुल that ताजिक or *Arabian horse* belongs to the best class of horses.)

Page 443—Horses exported to India from Kalayati[2] *or Kalatu to India*

" Its harbour is good, and many trading ships arrive there from India ... . These likewise carry away freights of *horses, which they sell advantageously in India.* "

It is clear from the foregoing references of *A. D. 1298* about the importation of *Persian, Arabian, Turkish* and other breeds of horses to India that these horses enjoyed a wide popularity in Indian kingdoms and that this Indo-foreign trade in horses was already an established feature of the commercial relations of India with other countries It is on this account that we find a definite mention of पारसिक, तुरष्क and ताजिक horses in the treatises on horses by जयदत्त and नकुल.

(*continued from the previous page*)

there are foreign." जयदत्त also considers the horses bred in the *Eastern* and *Southern* country as अधम or of low quality —

" अधमाष्टङ्गणैः सार्द्धं हुये प्राग्दक्षिणोद्भवाः ॥ "

" दाक्षिणात्यो भवेद्दुण्टो योऽधन्यः सर्ववाजिनाम् ॥ १७ ॥

जयहीना महादुष्टाः पूर्वदेशसमुद्भवाः । "

[1] Wright observes - " Horses were carried from the Red Sea, Persian Gulf, and places in their vicinity to the northern parts of India, from whence their breed was exported to the southern provinces. Such at least appears to have been the course of the traffic before it was disturbed by European influence. "

[2] *Kalayati* is *Kathāt*, on the Coast of Oman, not far to the southward of Muscat.

(6) The Western Cālukya King सोमेश्वर composed his encyclopaedic Sanskrit work मानसोल्लास [1] about *A. D. 1130* i. e. about 168 years earlier than Marco Polo's *Travels*. In this work there is a chapter on वाजिवाह्याली विनोद or the game on *Indian Polo.* [2] The king should understand the kinds of the best horses for this game brought before him by his officers (तेषां जातीः परीक्षित देशनामविभेदतः) Someśvara then names the following classes of horses

Best Horses—(1) काम्बोज, (2) यवन, (3) तेजी, (4) बाल्हीक, (5) आतल (6) ताख्खारक, (7) केकाण, (8) पोहार, (9) कान्दलेय, (10) यौधेय, (11) वाजपेयक, (12) वनायुज, (13) पारसीक.

Middle Breeds—(14) तैत्तिल, (15) वत्स, (16) कान्धार, (17) वामतेय, (18) सैन्धव, (19) सावित्र, (20) पार्वतेय, (21) काश्मीर, (22) साम्बतीयक, (23) तर्जी, (24) कुलज, (25) नीहार, (26) सारस्वत, (27) तुरुष्क.

Inferior Breeds—(28) मेदक, (29) आर्जुनेय, (30) त्रैगर्त, (31) गुर्जर, (32) राजस, (33) आवन्त्य, (34) सौराष्ट्र, (35) पारियात्र, (36) सहारक, (37) दुग्धवाट, (38) स्तब्धवाट etc.

It will be seen from the above list that many foreign breeds of horses such as पारसीक, तुरुष्क, तोख्खारक, केंकाण, बाह्लीक, तेजी etc. were considered best horses about A. D. 1130, when Someśvara ruled in the Deccan The question of the identification of all these breeds of horses mentioned by सोमेश्वर, as also those mentioned in other works will have to be considered separately as such identification has a direct bearing on the history of foreign commerce with India.

In the वाजिवाह्याली (Indian Polo) chapter referred to above there is no occasion for सोमेश्वर to mention the food for the horses. Accordingly there is no mention of चणक or gram in it [3]

[1] Ed. by G K Shrigondekar, G O S. Baroda, Vol II, 1939.

[2] Ibid, pp. 211-224—वाजिवाह्याली विनोद—It is worth while comparing the horse-lore in this chapter with that in the horse-treatises of जयदत्त and नकुल. See also Mr G. K Shrigondekar's paper on "Indian Polo" in the Proceedings of the Indian Ori Conference, Allahabad of 1926.

[3] I note here some references to चणक and its uses found in the मानसोल्लास Vol. II (Baroda) 1939 :-

P. 10 — चणकौदन (rice boiled with gram) used for वास्तूपशमन.

P. 115— Chapter on अन्नभोग—चणक to be used in cookery after grinding it in a घरट्ट —हरिमन्थ (= चणक) pulse fried with spices (p. 119),

P. 261—Chapter on महिष विनोद— चणक pulse to be given to he buffaloes used for fight.

(*continued on the next page*)

(7) The lexicon *Amarakośa* mentions सैन्धव as the name of a horse (see क्षत्रियवर्ग of Kānda II of *Amarakośa*, ed. by N. G. Sardesai and H. D. Sharma). It mentions also four breeds of horses as follows—

P. 185— "४६—वनायुजाः पारसीकाः काम्बोजा वाल्हिका हयाः" The commentator क्षीरस्वामिन् explains :— "एते जाताः हयविशेषाः । एवं तुक्खारावृयोऽपि"

The *Amarakośa* (Between A. D. 500 and 800) refers to the पारसीक or Persian horses. This reference is important as it is one of the earliest references to पारसीक horses we have so far recorded. क्षीरस्वामिन् adds the तुक्खार breed to the four breeds mentioned by *Amara*. The date of क्षीरस्वामिन् is about *A. D. 1050.*

(8) The *Brhatsamhitā* of Varāhamihira (C. A. 500) contains a small section on अश्वलक्षण (chap. 66 in 5 verses) but it mentions no breeds of horses in it though it mentions चणक.

(9) Narahari in his medical glossary called राजनिघण्टु of *C. A. D. 1450* refers to the following breeds [1] of horses :—

(1) आरट्ट, (2) सिन्धुज, (3) वनायुज, (4) पारसीक, (5) कांबोज, (6) वाल्हिक, (7) माम्राण, (8) शेफक.

(10) During the Polonnaruva period of the history of Ceylon (A. D. 1017-1235) *horses*, chariots and elephants were used at times in warfare but an army of which they formed part was rather the exception than the rule because there were no convenient routes to follow in a thickly wooded country like Ceylon. The soldiers as a rule travelled on foot and the generals were carried in palanquins with parasols held over them as a sign of their authority [2] Ceylon's trade with the West began

---

(*continued from the previous page*)

P. 273--Chapter on मत्स्य विनोद (*Angling*) — Balls of चणक पिष्ट or gram flour with boiled rice to be used for feeding *fishes*

Pages 183-286—Boar-hunt (वराह मृगया) is described Boars are very fond of चणक (सूकराः चणकोत्सया.) — several uses of चणक for tempting the boars before the king hunted them are described.

The foregoing references clearly prove that in *A D 1130* the use of चणक or *gram* for feeding *buffaloes* and *boars* was an established practice.

[1] Vide p. 35 of अष्टांगहृदयकोष by K. M. Vaidya, Trichur, 1936—राजनिघण्टु is quoted here as follows :—

" आरट्टसिन्धुजवनायुजपारसीक-
काम्बोजवाल्हिकमुखा विविधास्तुरंगाः ।
साम्राणशेफकमुखा अपि देशतः स्युः "

[2] Vide p. 91 of *Early History of Ceylon*, by G. C. Mendis, 1938.

very early. It is not certain whether the Arabs had dealings with Ceylon before the Christian Era From the 2nd century A. D. to the early part of the 3rd century Greek traders came to Ceylon. There was a revival of trade after Constantine (A. D. 323-337) who made Byzantium the capital of the Roman Empire. Persians, who were Christians of the Nestorian sect also traded with the South-west of India and Ceylon but their trade ceased in the 7th century when Persia was captured by the Muslims. The conquest of Alexandria by the Caliphs in A. D. 638 stopped Ceylon's direct trade with Byzantine Empire. Before the end of the 10th century the Arabs established a trading settlement in Colombo. [1] In view of these circumstances it is doubtful if any foreign breeds of horses were imported to Ceylon as they were imported to India from Persia and Arabia say from A. D. 800 onwards.

(11) We have already seen that जयदत्त and नकुल have stated that the breeds of horses from the दाक्षिणात्य and पूर्व (Southern and Eastern) countries or provinces were of the most inferior quality (अधम). During the rule of the Pāla dynasty in Bengal (A D. 750-1200) cavalry was not neglected because they had to fight with Pratīhāras who were strong in cavalry. Bengal had no good breed of horses. Horses were imported from foreign countries. It is said in the Mongyr plate of Devapāla (A. D. (810-850) that the horses met their old mares in the Kāmboja country. Kāmboja was reputed for the finest breed in ancient times.[2]

(13) Dr. B. C. Law in his learned article[3] on " Animals in Early Jain and Buddhist Literature " recently published records the following interesting information[4] about horses gathered from the *Jātakas* .-

---

[1] Ibid, pp 73-74.

[2] Vide p 143 of *Early History of Bengal*, by P. L Paul, Calcutta, 1939.

[3] *Indian Culture*, Vol. XII (July-Sept 1945), pp. 6-7.

[4] Dr. A. D. Pusalker has drawn my attention to the following references to *Horses* in Dr. B. C. Law's *Tribes in Ancient India* (B. O R. Institute, 1944) :—" Horse-dealers figure prominently amongst the *Gandhāra* trades and we learn from the वायुपुराण that the *Gandhāran* horses were considered the best of all (ch. 99) (Page 17)— "Horse dealers from northern districts used to bring horses to *Benares* for sale (*Jātaka II* p. 287). *Sindh* horses were available in Benares and were used as the royal horses of ceremony (*Jātaka II* p. 338) Law, p. 112.

" *Horses—Sindh* horses are milk-white and thorough-bred. (Jātaka Nos. 22, 23, 160, 211, 529, 547, 538). They are white as lilies, swift as the wind and well trained (Ibid, Nos 544, 266, 547). Horses like to eat *pears* (Ibid, 176). Thorough-bred horses are *fed on parched rice drippings broken meats and grass and red rice-powder* (Ibid No. 254). There are big chest-nut horses (*Suhanu Jātaka* No. 158). Horses are fierce (Ibid No. 115). When they become rogue they bite quiet horses, but when two rogues meet they lick each other's body (Ibid No. 158). The horse can also imitate men. A horse watching its tame trainer as he trampled on and on in front imitated him and limped too (*Girdanta Jātaka No. 184.*) A thorough-bred war-horse will not bathe in the same place where an ordinary horse took its bath (Ibid No. 25). Horses were employed for drawing state-chariots (Ibid No 22) and cars (Ibid No. 211) Thorough-bred *Sindh* horses sheathed in mail were used for war purposes (Ibid, No. 23 ; cf. Ibid, No. 547). The *Valāha* and *Sindhu* are the horses of superior breed (*Barhut,* III, Pl. XXVI, fig. 136).

There was a *trade in horses* (*Jātaka* Nos. 4 and 5). There were *valuers* employed by kings to fix the proper price of horses, elephants and the like (Ibid, No. 5). Good horses used to fetch high prices. A high-bred foal was sold at Benares at a high price, separate price, was paid for the foal's four feet, for its tail, for its head—six purses of a thousand pieces of money, one for each (Ibid, No. 254). This horse could run at such a high speed that nobody could see it at all. It could run over a pond without getting its hoofs wet, and gallop over lotus leaves without even pushing one of them under water (Ibid, No. 254)—There was a flying horse, white all over and beaked like a crow, with hair like *muñja* grass, possessed of supernatural power, able to fly through the air. From Himālaya it flew through the air until it came to Ceylon. It carried 250 men at a time (*Valāhassa Jātaka* No. 196)".

There is no reference to चणक or gram as food for horses in the above account of ancient Indian horses, though it refers to

rice, meat[1] and *grass* as food for horses. The *breeds* of horses mentioned in this account are *Valāha* and *Sindhu* only. The reference to *trade in horses* is in harmony with the references to such trade recorded by me already in this paper.

(13) In view of the Indo-foreign horse-trade referred to in the Indian and Foreign sources of history the following remarks of Geoffrey Brooke in his book. " *The Way of a Man with a Horse* " (London, 1929) on the history of the Horse and Horsemanship will be read with peculiar interest —

Chapter I — The Horse.

" Throughout the past ages to the present day we find the horse's many qualities appreciated and turned to the use of man. His courage and endurance have repeatedly been recognized as dominant factors in war and his original use for this purpose dates back to pre-historic times Archaeological evidence proves this to have been the case in *India*, *Persia*, *Assyria*, and *Egypt*, where the horse was bred and trained as a means of conveyance In *2737 B C* the Chinese[2] are known to have made use of cavalry.

---

[1] Geoffray Brooke in his book " *The Way of a Man with a horse* " (London, 1929) has dealt with the question of *feeding of sick horses* He prescribes *eggs, milk, bread, biscuits, beer and wine* for supplying nourishment in a concentrated form *Beer, Stout* and *Wines* are to be given chiefly to stimulate appetite A quart of *Beer* or *Stout* and ½ bottle of wine are to be usually given (P, 101) " A horse that does not appear to be thriving may be given a wine-glass-ful of *Cod-liver* oil in thrice the amount in treacle mixed in his feed once a day "

[2] Vide " *Ceremonial Usages of the Chinese*, B C. 1121, Translated by W. R. Gingell, London, 1852—This Chinese classic (3000 years old) refers to royal *chariots* and *banners* (pp. 18-26) It describes how men of the *Chow* Dynasty (*1121 B C*) paid particular regard to carriages, and then records in detail the principles of carriage building. It refers to *military carriages, small carriages* with one pole and a pair of *horses* on each side of the pole and *large carriages* with two shafts and an *ox* between them. The small carriages were used for *hunting* and *war* purposes. There were also " *plain carriages* " used as vehicles, drawn by *ox* or *horse*—This book then lays down the " *regulations by which the people bred horses* " Horses were of *six kinds* — (1) *thorough-bred*, (2) *charger*, (3) *horse of colour*, (4) *roadster*, (5) *hunter*, and (6) *common-bred*. There were officers to look after the Castration of horses, and officers to supervise the harnessing and unharnessing. There were other officers to manage the vicious horses.— These observations are evidently about 1000 years older than those in Kauṭilya's chapter on अश्वाध्यक्ष in the अर्थशास्त्र and about 2000 years earlier than those in the treatises of जयदत्त and नकुल.

Amongst other places in the *Bible* we find in the *Book of Kings*, reference made to Solomon's captains, rulers of his chariots and his horsemen. The cavalry of *Alexandar the Great*[1] was famous in their days throughout his many campaigns. We know too that the ancient Greeks were highly skilled horsemen and devoted much of their time in equitation. There is both sound advice and practical knowledge to be derived from *Xenophon's treatise on horsemanship*. It is interesting to note that *Herodotus* in his book *Thalia* refers to *Darius* sustaining an accident when hunting on horse-back. We know of course that the *Egyptians*, *Phoenicians* and *Romans* employed horses in chariots in addition to normal cavalry of those times.

Throughout past centuries to this day the *Arabs* have been recognized as *a nation of horsemen* and it is to these people and their particular breed of horse that we owe the wonderful *Thorough bred of modern times*. Among the early *British* at the time of the Roman conquest the *Iceni*[2] held a justly high reputation for the excellence of their horses and their horsemanship.

In mediaeval[3] times good horsemanship was highly esteemed as witness the *English Knights* who won their spurs by gallantry on the field of battle."

The foregoing data gives us a glimpse into the history of Indian interest in horses and the consequent importation of foreign horses into India from very early times. We have seen already that the *Amarakośa* refers to the *Pārasīka* or Persian horses. We know also that Pulakeśin II of the Deccan sent an embassy to Persia in A. D. 625. Are we to suppose that the

---

1 Alexander's favourite charger *Bucephalus* died at *Jhelum* city of the Hydaspes in N.India after carrying him in all his campaigns. Alexander built at this place a city in memory of his charger after his battle with Porus. (Vide p. 110 of Smith's *Smaller Classical Dictionary* Everyman's Library, London, 1913.)

2 *Iceni* — a powerful people in Britain dwelling in the modern counties of Suffolk and Norfolk. Their revolt from the Romans under their heroic queen Boadicēa is celebrated in history (Ibid, p. 277).

3 Mongol horseman under Jenghiz Khān (died *1227 A. D.*) were celebrated for their conquests — " A Mongol on a single pony will ride from Urga to Kalgan - by the shortest route 600 miles " (Vide p. 133 of *Unknown Mongolia* by Carruthers, Vol. II). See article on *Mongol Army* in *JRAS*, 1943, p. 51.

Persian horses[1] began to be imported to India after A. D. 600 ? According to the *Bombay Gazetteer* the demand for Persian and Arabian horses arose from the scare created by Mussalman cavalry. If this statement is true to history the horse-trade from Persia and Arabia must have been started some time after the conquest of Sind by the Arabs in *A. D 712*. The Arabs had made several raids on the coasts of Western India, one of these in *A. D. 637* from Bahrein and Oman in the Per sian Gulf plundered the Konkon coast near Thana (see Elliot and Dowson's *History*, I, pp. 415-416). In view of the above history of the trade in *Persian* and *Arabian* horses I am inclined to think that the treatises on horses by जयदत्त and नकुल viz. the अश्ववैद्यक and अश्वचिकित्सित are *later than C. A. D. 800* as they refer to the पारसीक (Persian) and ताजिक (Arabian) horses among the best breeds of horses. These treatises were probably composed before A. D. 1300 as they show in a remarkable degree the necessity felt by

1 According to *Bombay Gazetteer* [Vol. XIII (Thana) Part II, p 403] The Thana coast has taken a leading part in foreign commerce of Western India in the following periods of history —

(i) *B. C 2500 -- B. C. 500* — There are signs of trade with *Egypt Phoenicia* and *Babylon*.

(ii) *B C. 250 — A. D 250* — There are dealings with, perhaps settlements of, *Greeks* and *Romans*

(iii) *A D 250 — 640* — There are *Persian* alliances and *Persian* settlements

(iv) *A D 700 — 1200* — There are *Mussalman* trade relations and Mussalman settlements from *Arabia* and Persia.

During the reign of the great Nosherwan (*A. D 531–578*), the relations between *Western India* and *Persia* were extremely close In the several lists of the articles of trade imported to India from outside before the period of the rule of the *Śilāhāras* (A D. 810–1260) I don't find any references to the import of horses The *Gazetteer* observes (p 431) —

"The chief trade in *Animals* was towards the close of the period (1290), a great *import of horses* from the *Persian Gulf* and from *Arabia* No ships came to Thana without horses and the Thana chief was so anxious to secure them that he agreed not to trouble the pirates so long as they let him have the horses as his share of the plunder This great *demand for horses seems to have risen from the scare among the Hindu rulers of the Deccan caused by the Mussalman cavalry* As many as 10,000 horses a year are said to have been imported" Speaking of Mussalman trade (p 444) the *Gazetteer* observes.—"The constant demand for *horses* kept up a close connection between the *Thana* and *East Arabian* ports and there was a considerable trade with the Zangibar coast."

the Hindu Kings[1] of the period 800-1300 A. D. of providing such manuals for the care of their cavalry with a view to combating the Mussalman trained cavalry like that used by Shiāb-ud-din against Prithivīrāja of Ajmer in *A. D. 1191.*

If चणक or gram came to be used as food for horses in India say between A. D. 800 and 1300, the period during which the above mentioned treatises on horses were composed we must investigate whether the use of चणक as food for horses has travelled to India along with the Persian and Arabian horses or otherwise. In connection with this problem it is necessary to locate references to चणक as food for horses in *Persian, Arabic* and *Turkish* sources prior to A. D. 800 but I must leave this task to scholars conversant with these sources I have tried in this paper to record the history of चणक or gram as food for horses *between C A D. 800 and 1870.* I propose to deal with the question of the antiquity of चणक on the strength of Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit sources on a subsequent occasion and the present paper is only an off-shoot of the main study pertaining to the history of this important grain on which horses have been fed for more than 1000 years in India.

---

[1] जयदत्त is called " महासामन्त " in the colophons of the different chapters of his अश्ववैद्यक.

Some Interesting Problems in

MAHĀBHĀRATA TEXT TRANSMISSION

BY

S. K BELVALKAR

Problem No 3*

When Duryodhana and Arjuna came simultaneously to Kṛṣna in Dvārakā to ask for his assistance in the forth-coming war, Kṛṣna, wishing to satisfy them both, proposed (Udyoga 7. 17)

ते वा युधि दुराधर्षा भवन्त्वेकस्य सैनिका. ।
अयुध्यमान' सग्रामे न्यस्तशस्त्रोऽहमेकत ॥

Arjuna accepted Krsna, alone and weaponless, and Duryodhana the ten thousand warriors of Krsna known as the *Nārāyanas*. Krsna eventually consented to become Arjuna's charioteer, and as such could only give advice, but not himself take any part in fighting. In the Bhismaparvan, chapter 55 (= GK 59), we are told that Krsna was *not* able to remain true to his word. On the third day of the battle, after a weak opening, Bhisma the Generalissimo of the Kauravas acquitted himself so valorously that Arjuna and the Pāndavas were not able to offer him any resistance, and the ranks fled away from the field disregarding Sātyaki's efforts to stem the rout This angers Krsna to such an extent that he leaps down from the chariot and, with the discus named *Sudarśana* in hand (55 89-92), rushes upon Bhīṣma with intent to kill him. Arjuna, however, runs after Krṣṇa and stops him at the tenth step (*dasame pade* : 55. 98), and persuades him to return, promising to fight Bhisma more manfully, a promise which Arjuna amply fulfils during the rest of that day and on the day following

---

* Problem No 1 appeared in the *Annals, BORI*, Vol. XXV, pp. 82-87, and No. 2 in *Ibid.* pp 239-243. — The Mbh references in this essay are all to the Critical Edition unless otherwise specified

Duryodhana had all along suspected Bhīṣma (and Droṇa) of partiality for the Pāṇḍavas. Earlier on the third day of the battle, Duryodhana had said (5. 54. 35ff.),

अनुग्राह्याः पाण्डुसुता नूनं तव पितामह ।
यथेमां क्षमसे वीर वध्यमानां वरूथिनीम् ॥
....
यदि नाहं परित्याज्यो युवाभ्यामिह संयुगे ।
विक्रमेणानुरूपेण युध्येतां पुरुषर्षभौ ॥

Bhīṣma in reply said that the Pāndavas were really invincible in battle. He would, nevertheless, do his best (6. 54. 41):

यत्तु शक्य मया कर्तुं वृद्धेनाद्य नृपोत्तम ।
करिष्यामि यथाशक्ति प्रेक्षेदानीं सबान्धव' ॥

It was after this that Bhīsma displayed his prowess which compelled Krsna to break his vow. When therefore, at the end of the day and also on the following day, the Pāndava side is again triumphant, poor Duryodhana, himself wounded in the battle and having lost eight of his own brothers (6 60 24-33), renews his complaint to Bhīsma (6. 61. 26ff), who narrates to him what is known as the "Viśvopākhyāna" (chapters 61-64), which contains a legend about Krsna and Arjuna being the Avatāras respectively of Nārāyana the Supreme Being, and of Nara the Great Sage.[1] The narration of this legend, of course, does not materially affect the war, which resumes its wonted course the morning following.

On the ninth day of the battle we have, in all the recensions and testimonia without exception, a repetition of the whole series of events including, even Duryodhana's reproof and Bhīṣma's assurance, and culminating in Krsna's leaping down from the chariot and rushing towards Bhīsma, and of his returning to the charioteer's seat upon the importunities of Arjuna, who stops him, again, *daśame pade* (6. 102. 64). This time, however, Arjuna's promise to mend and fight better does *not* produce results, and

---

[1] This *Upākhyāna* refers to the doctrine of the *Four Vyūhas*, which is a sectarian dogma not known to the *Bhagavadgītā*. It is found in portions of the Epic generally considered relatively late.

Bhīsma still remains the master of the field, so much so that Krsna and the Pāṇḍavas repair that night to Bhīsma's camp and ask his advice as to what they should do to win the battle.

Now when a battle is raging on for a number of days, there are naturally bound to be repetitions of incidents; but this incident of Krsna's rushing upon Bhīsma is not an ordinary incident, and it loses all its *raison d'être* by being repeated. Furthermore, if, stung by Duryodhana's reproof, Bhīsma is to prove his mettle, he is ordinarily expected to keep up that spirit, as he in fact does on the ninth day, and not allow Arjuna to get the better of him once more, as happens on the third day. It is also somewhat odd that, on that third day, Arjuna should have been overcome by just a brief spell of lethargy, which is preceded as well as followed by continuous periods of very vigorous fighting

The principal moments of the repeated incident are: (i) Bhīsma's superior exploit third day (55. 3-39), ninth day (102. 1-29), (ii) Arjuna's lethargy (*mrduyuddhatā*): third day (55. 40-79), ninth day (102. 30-51), (iii) Krsna's passionate onrush third day (55 80-92), ninth day (102 52-58); (iv) Bhīsma's response, third day (55 93-95), ninth day (102 59-61), and (v) Arjuna's overtaking and persuading Krsna to return, and resuming the fight. third day (55. 96-132), ninth day (102. 62-78) On a critical comparison of the corresponding portions of the text from the third and the ninth days of the battle, if we find one of the accounts more detailed and exaggerated and couched mostly in the Tristubh metre in place of the normal epic Anustubh, that account is likely to be late or secondary. This is so in the case of the description of the last three moments (iii-v) belonging to the third day In view of this it would be quite safe to conclude that the repetition of the incident of Krsna's rushing against Bhīsma on the third day of the battle is secondary, being an afterthought primarily designed to give occasion for the sectarian *Viśvopākhyāna* being brought into the picture. Such a conclusion would also gain in probability by the added circumstance (which cannot escape being noticed by even a superficial reader) that the descriptions of the first two moments (i-ii) of the incident belonging to the above two days contain a very large number of verbally identical stanzas, lines

and phrases, which makes it impossible to suppose that the texts belonging to the two days in question could have been quite independent compositions.

It is in this substantially identical portion of the text that a very interesting problem relating to Mahābhārata text-transmission confronts us, which I propose to here very briefly indicate. I must say that the problem struck me as a problem only after the work of constituting the text of the two chapters in accordance with the established procedure in the matter had been completed.[1] That the problem would assume the form in which I am going to present it here was the least expected. In order that readers might exactly appreciate the situation, I present in the pages that follow the constituted text of chapter 55 of the Bhīsmaparvan, stanzas 34–66^{ab} and chapter 102, stanzas 24–52 in opposite columns, the portion common to the two chapters being given once only in the centre, while the variant readings are placed in the two side columns. Stars indicate that the lines are wanting in the description of the day concerned. For facility of reference I have numbered the entire text by lines 1 to 67.

[1] Thus for instance in line 1 यनमानापि (55. 34^a) was accepted on the evidence of K_{3-5} B D (except D_2), while यनमानाश्च (102. 24^a) on the evidence of Ś$_1$ $K_{0-2, 4}$ B $M_{1-3, 5}$.

In line 2 °प्रपीडिता (55 34^d) was accepted on the evidence of Ś$_1$ $K_{0-3, 5}$ D_2 $G_{1, 3}$ M , while °प्रपीडितान् (102 24^d) on the evidence of all MSS. except D_1 TG , Ś$_1$ $K_{0, 1}$ om.

In line 13 देवकिनन्दन (55. 40^b) was accepted on the evidence of Ś$_1$ K $D_{2, 6}$, while यादवनन्दन (102 30^b) is given by all MSS. without exception.

In line 30 रश्मिमान् (55 47^d) was accepted on the evidence of Ś$_1$ K_5 TG_{2-4} M_{1-4} , while रश्मिवान् (102. 38^d) on the evidence of Ś$_1$ K_{0-4} B DaDn $D_{1, 3, 4}$ (orig) $_{6-8}$ T_2 G_1 M_4

In line 55 तौ भीष्मशरविक्षतौ (55 60^b) was accepted on the evidence of Ś$_1$ $K_{0, 4}$ B DaDn $D_{3-5, 7}$, while भीष्मपार्थौ शरक्षतौ (102. 49^b) on the evidence of Ś$_1$ K_1.

It will be noted that in all these places there was no other variant as strongly supported as the one accepted ; several of the rejected readings were rejected by reason of some slight change or error, but otherwise they also support the accepted text.

Constituted Text of the Repeated Lines

[N B Insignificant variants are passed over without comment]

Line	Variant Readings Third Day 6 55 34-66[25]	Common Readings	Line	Variant Readings Ninth Day 6 102 24-52
1	यतमानापि	. . . . ते वीरा द्रवमाणान्महारथान् ।	1	यतमानाश्च
2	°प्रपीडिनाः	नाशक्नुवन्वारयितुं भीष्मबाण ।	2	°प्रपीडितान्
3		महेन्द्रसमवीर्येण वध्यमाना महाचमू ।	3	
4		अभज्यत महाराज न च द्वौ सह धावत· ।	4	
5		आविद्धरथनागाश्वं पतितध्वजकूबरम् ।	5	
6		अनीकं पाण्डुपुत्राणां हाहाभूतमचेतनम् ।	6	
7		जघानात्र पिता पुत्रं पुत्रश्च पितरं तथा ।	7	
8		प्रियं सखायं चाक्रन्दे सखा दैवबलात्कृत· ।	8	
9		विमुच्य कवचानन्ये पाण्डुपुत्रस्य सैनिका ।	9	
10		प्रकीर्य केशान्धावन्तः प्रत्यदृश्यन्त भारत ।	10	
11		तद्गोकुलमिवोद्भ्रान्तमुद्भ्रान्तरथकुञ्जरम् ।	11	
12		ददृशे पाण्डुपुत्रस्य सैन्यमार्तस्वरं तदा ।	12	
13	(a) तत्सैन्यं (b) देवकि°	प्रभज्यमानं (a) दृष्ट्वा (b) नन्दन ।	13	(a) सैन्यं तु (b) यादव°
14		उवाच पार्थं बीभत्सुं निगृह्य रथमुत्तमम् ।	14	
15	°स्त्वया	अयं स कालः संप्राप्त· पार्थ य· काङ्क्षित· ।	15	°स्तव
16	°द्विमुह्यसे	प्रहरास्मै नरव्याघ्र न चेन्मोहा ।	16	°न्यमुह्यसे
17	(a) यत्त्वया (b) पुरा	(a) कथितं वीर (b) राज्ञां समागमे ।	17	(a) यत्पुरा (b) त्वया

Line	Variant Readings Third Day: 6 55, 34–66[ab]	Common Readings	Line	Variant Readings Ninth Day: 6 102 24–52
*	* *	विराटनगरे पार्थ संजयस्य समीपत: ।	18	
19		भीष्मद्रोणमुखान्सर्वान्धार्तराष्ट्रस्य सैनिकान् ।	19	
20		सानुबन्धान्हनिष्यामि ये मां योत्स्यन्ति संयुगे ।	20	
21		इति तत्कुरु कौन्तेय सत्यं वाक्यमरिंदम ।	21	
		बीभत्सो पश्य सैन्यं स्वं भज्यमानं समन्तत: । क्षत्रधर्ममनुस्मृत्य युध्यस्व भरतर्षभ ।	22	
		द्रवनश्च महीपालान्सर्वान्यौधिष्ठिरे बले । इत्युक्तो वासुदेवेन तिर्यग्दृष्टिरधोमुखः ।	23	
		दृष्ट्वा हि समरे भीष्मं व्यात्ताननमिवान्तकम् । अकाम इव बीभत्सुरिदं वचनमब्रवीत् ।	24	
		भयार्ता संप्रणश्यन्ति सिंहं क्षुद्रमृगा इव । अवध्यानां वधं कृत्वा राज्यं वा नरकोत्तरम् ।	25	
		एवमुक्तः प्रत्युवाच वासुदेवं धनंजयः । दुःखानि वनवासे वा किं नु मे सुकृतं भवेत् ।	26	
27	विगाह्यैतद्बलार्णवम्	चोदयाश्वान्यतो भीष्म: ।	27	करिष्ये वचनं तव ।
*	* *	पातयिष्यामि दुर्धर्षं वृद्धं कुरुपितामहम् ।	28	
29		ततोऽश्वान्रजतप्रख्यांश्चोदयामास माधवः ।	29	
30	(a) °रथो (b) °क्षो रश्मिमानिव	यतो भीष्म(a) . . राजन्दुष्प्रे(b) . . ।	30	(a) °स्ततो (b) °क्ष्यो रश्मिवानिव
31		ततस्तत्पुनरावृत्तं युधिष्ठिरबलं महत् ।	31	
32		दृष्ट्वा पार्थं महाबाहुं भीष्मायोद्यन्तमाहवे ।	32	
33		ततो भीष्मः कुरुश्रेष्ठः सिंहवद्विनदन्मुहुः ।	33	
34	तूर्णं	धनंजयरथं शरवर्षैरवाकिरत् ।	34	शीघ्रं

Line	Variant Readings Third Day : 6. 55. 34–66[ab]	Common Readings	Line	Variant Readings Ninth Day 6. 102 24–52
35		क्षणेन स रथस्तस्य सहय· सहसारथि· ।	35	
36	संछन्नो न प्रकाशते	शरवर्षेण महता ।	36	न प्राज्ञायत किंचन
37	सत्त्ववान्[1]	वासुदेवस्त्वसंभ्रान्तो धैर्यमास्थाय ।	37	सात्वत·[1]
38		चोदयामास तानश्वान्वितुन्नान्भीष्मसायकै ।	38	
39		ततः पार्थो धनुर्गृह्य दिव्यं जलदनिस्वनम् ।	39	
40	त्रिभि·	पातयामास भीष्मस्य धनुश्छित्त्वा · · शरै ।	40	शितैः
41		स च्छिन्नधन्वा कौरव्य· पुनरन्यन्महद्धनु ।	41	
42		निमेषान्तरमात्रेण मज्यं चक्रे पिता तव ।	42	
43		विचकर्ष ततो दोर्भ्यां धनुर्जलदनिस्वनम् ।	43	
44		अथास्य तदपि क्रुद्धश्चिच्छेद धनुरर्जुन· ।	44	
45		तस्य तत्पूजयामास लाघवं शंतनो सुत ।	45	
46	भो पाण्डुनन्दन	साधु पार्थ महाबाहो साधु ।	46	कुन्तीसुतेति च
47		त्वय्येवैतद्युक्तरूपं महत्कर्म धनंजय ।	*	* *
48		प्रीतोऽस्मि सुदृढ पुत्र कुरु युद्धं मया सह ।	*	* *
49		इति पार्थं प्रशस्याथ प्रगृह्यान्यन्महद्धनु । ममाभाष्यैनमपरं प्रगृह्य रुचिरं धनु· ।		
50	वीरः[2]	मुमोच समरे शरान्पार्थरथं प्रति ।	50	भीष्मः[2]

[1] *Sāttvataḥ* is a more familiar epithet, *sattvavān* is somewhat unusual

[2] *Vīraḥ* is less specific than *Bhīṣmaḥ*.

Line	Variant Readings Third Day . 6 55 34–66[ab]	Common Readings	Line	Variant Readings Ninth Day : 6 102. 24–52
51		अदर्शयद्वासुदेवो हययाने परं बलम् ।	51	
52	मण्डलान्यचरल्लघु	मोघान्कुर्वञ्शरांस्तस्य . . ।	52	मण्डलानि विदर्शयन्
53		तथापि भीष्मः सुदृढं वासुदेवधनंजयौ ।	*	* *
54		विव्याध निशितैर्बाणैः सर्वगात्रेषु मारिष ।	*	* *
55	तौ भीष्मशरविक्षतौ	शुशुभाते नरव्याघ्रौ . . . . ।	55	भीष्मपार्थौ शरक्षतौ
56	नर्दन्तौ	गोवृषाविव विषाणोल्लिखिताङ्कितौ ।	56	संरब्धौ
57		पुनश्चापि सुसंक्रुद्धः शरैः संनतपर्वभिः ।	*	* *
58		कृष्णयोर्युधि संरब्धो भीष्मो व्यावारयद्दिश ।	*	* *
59		वार्ष्णेयं च शरैस्तीक्ष्णैः कम्पयामास रोषितः ।	*	* *
60		मुहुरभ्युत्स्मयन्भीष्म प्रहस्य स्वनवत्तदा ।	*	* *
61		ततः कृष्णस्तु समरे दृष्ट्वा भीष्मपराक्रमम् ।	*	* *
62	संप्रेक्ष्य च महाबाहुः[1]	. . पार्थस्य मृदुयुद्धताम् ।	62	वासुदेवस्तु संप्रेक्ष्य[1]
63		भीष्मं च शरवर्षाणि सृजन्तमनिशं युधि ।	63	
64		प्रपतन्तमिवादित्यं मध्यमासाद्य सेनयोः ।	64	
65		वरान्वरान्विनिघ्नन्तं पाण्डुपुत्रस्य सैनिकान् ।	65	
66		युगान्तमिव कुर्वाणं भीष्मं यौधिष्ठिरे बले ।	66	
67	अमृष्यमाणो भगवान्केशवः	परवीरहा ।	67	नामृष्यत महाबाहुर्माधवः

[1] The *ca* in line 62 refers to *dṛṣṭvā* in line 61. When line 61 was omitted, the *ca* had to be changed to *tu*.

Upon a careful comparison of the text as presented here, the following five points of critical importance would seem to emerge. (1) There are four cases, three of which are attempts to turn a *lectio difficilior* (belonging to the description of the third day) into a *lectio facilior* (belonging to the ninth day), and the fourth a phenomenon of case-attraction. This would mean that — so far as the present passage goes — it is the third-day description that is earlier and original, while it is the ninth-day description (which on other considerations and in other sections we found to be earlier and original) that we have to now put down as a modification from that of the third-day. The four cases are: (a) in line 1, the reading यतमानापि which contains an archaic double *saṁdhi*, while the reading यतमानाश्च removes that grammatical irregularity, (b) in line 2, the reading भीष्मबाणप्रपीडिता· of the third day which gives the reason why the warriors were unable to stop the fugitive soldiers; the corresponding भीष्मबाणप्रपीडितान् (presumably caused by attraction to महारथान् above) adding nothing to the main statement नाशक्नुवन्; (c) in line 13, the form देवकिनन्दनः (instead of the regular देवकीनन्दन·), which has to be explained away (like the proper name Kālidāsa) with the help of Pāṇini 6. 3. 63, whereas the corresponding यादवनन्दन has no grammatical irregularity to be explained away; (d) in line 30 the form रश्मिमान् (in place of the more usual रश्मिवान्), which has to be explained, under Pāṇini 8 2. 9, by subsuming the word रश्मि under the यवादिगण, which is an आकृतिगण or a list of words to which occasional additions in a case of need are permitted Some persons may not be inclined to attach much importance to these small points of grammar, but the fact is undoubted that four instances all possessing the same tendency have been collected from a passage of just thirty stanzas.

Here is another feature (2) offered by the same passage. Lines 17–21 contain Kṛṣṇa's exhortation to Arjuna, in which the latter is reminded of certain boastful words formerly uttered by him, which he is now called upon to make good. Line 18 of this passage is extra in the ninth-day text, and its purpose obviously is to more narrowly specify the occasion of Arjuna's earlier speech. Arjuna, it would seem, had boasted of his ability to kill Bhīṣma and others not only in Upaplavya (a suburb of the Virāṭa

capital) in the presence of Samjaya (5. 47. 46 ff.), but also in his return-message to Duryodhana conveyed through Duryodhana's messenger Ulūka, who met the Pāṇḍavas in their army-camp at Kurukṣetra (cf. 5. 158-160). As can be easily seen, it is in the nature of a later text to more narrowly specify an earlier dubious reference.

In the next place (3), when warriors fought, it was quite in the order of the day that they should wound (and even kill) each other's horses and charioteers. Accordingly, Bhīsma could legitimately wound Krsna the charioteer of Arjuna, as well as Arjuna himself. Lines 53-61 in the account of the third day describe how this happened. In the account of the ninth day, lines 53-54 and 57-61 are altogether absent, and, what is more noteworthy, the pronoun तौ ('those two') which in line 55 (as found in the third day's account) stands obviously for Krsna and Arjuna, is, in the ninth day's description, dropped, and Bhīsma and Arjuna are specifically mentioned. Obviously, the author of the ninth day's description did not wish to unnecessarily emphasise Bhīsma's having wounded the Divine charioteer of Arjuna. Such a sentiment belongs to a later age.

Further (4), we have already seen that on the ninth or the penultimate day of his Generalship, Bhīsma all along retains his hold upon Arjuna in the fight. Such words as those in lines 47 and 48, or the description in lines 57-61 should accordingly fit in on the penultimate day, and not on a day like the third when Bhīsma is unable to offer to the end an effective resistance to Arjuna. Actually, however, the words are found in the account of the third day (as though that was the real penultimate day of Bhīsma's fight), and not in the account of the ninth day. If they were there originally in both the accounts, it is difficult to explain their omission from a context where they fitted better, and their retention in a context where they did not fit, unless we suppose that the context where they now are was at one time the context in which they did actually fit; that day, in other words, being, *in an earlier stage of the Epic*, the penultimate day of Bhīsma's Generalship. That the present eighteen-day battle is frightfully padded by reduplications, exaggerations, and inventions of the miraculous is generally conceded, so that a saving of six days this way

would be quite welcome, though it might be naturally very difficult to prove it now by adequate objective evidence.

Finally (5), compare and contrast carefully the text of lines 22-27 as they appear in the third day's account and in that of the ninth. The words as we find them in the earlier account fit in there quite well, and they could just as well have fitted, in the same form, in the later or the ninth day's account. But there has been a change, which could only have been from the third day to the ninth, and not vice versa. The change could only have been motivated by the desire to explain how it was that, in spite of the great and unforgettable teaching of the *Bhagavad-gītā* revealed on the first day of the battle, Arjuna could still be invaded by the old scruples and exhibit no interest or vigour in the fight. So an attempt seems to have been made, in the account of the ninth day, to show that, although the old scruples continued still to bother Arjuna, he eventually did pull himself up and repeat in exactly the same words[1] the promise — *kariṣye vacanaṃ tava* — that he had made in BG. 18 73[d].

The question naturally suggests itself why was not the Gītā *motif* also introduced on the third day? It cannot be seriously maintained that the Gītā teaching was fresher on the third day than on the ninth If the great teaching could at all be forgotten on the ninth day, it could just as well have been forgotten on the third. Further, if the Gītā teaching needed a reminder, we expect the reminder to be administered on the day that is to be followed by Arjuna's accordant action thereafter, so that there might be no need later of a reminder to the reminder, as would have been the case if the Gītā *motif* had also been introduced on the third day. There may also be this other explanation possible. The author of the later remodelling of lines 22-27 on the ninth day was greatly obsessed by the importance of the BG. teaching, which, in that more primitive stage in the development of the Epic when the third day of Bhīṣma's Generalship was the penultimate day, might not yet have attained to its subsequent pre-eminence That the present Bhagavadgītā, like the present

[1] The line 28 (which is extra in the ninth day) only specifies what the Lord's *vacanam* was which Arjuna was going to follow.

Mahābhārata, had at least one (if not two) earlier less developed forms is generally conceded, although real differences begin the moment one proceeds to say what the earlier and the earliest forms of the Poem were like.

The Mahābhārata itself is our authority for the view that, before the Epic assumed its present form and dimension of approximately one lac of stanzas, it was a smaller poem of about 24,000 stanzas devoted to an account of the origin and history of the Bharata clan, culminating in the great fratricidal war, but not yet containing the several subsidiary stories or *upākhyānas*; and that in its earliest form the Poem was limited to a descriptive account of the Victory or Jaya in the war, and need not therefore have extended beyond eight or ten thousand stanzas. Nor need we suppose that the transition from the Jaya to the Bhārata and again from the Bhārata to the Mahābhārata stages, was made all at one stroke and without intervening sub-stages. It is as though a coat originally made to fit a youth of small stature came in time to be enlarged by the opening out of certain seams and the occasional addition of cloth-pieces here and there to fit the body of an oversize adult, until someone thought once again of remodelling and substantially altering its entire cut and size and fashioning a loose overcoat out of it, — care being taken all along this triple process of sartorial evolution that no bits of the old cloth were absolutely thrown away as waste. In the final product of the tailoring art—however commendable the skill of the sempsters — it was inevitable that, once in a while, the seams, holes, creases and other vestiges of the earlier stages of the coat obtruded themselves here and there Some of these, as for instance the reduplication of the *Kṛṣna-pratijñā-bhanga* incident with the express purpose of engrafting the *Viśvopākhyāna* on the main story, are plainly discernible. Others, however, are more subtle and elusive, as when in the body of an added passage (e. g. the account of the third day of the battle), which shows the usual signs of lateness, a fragment is discovered (e. g. the 67 lines above given) showing evident marks of an earlier stage. Until all such cases that might present themselves throughout the whole Epic are carefully garnered and tabulated, it would be hazardous to definitely say to what stage a given fragment

belongs and what the specific form of the Poem then was of which it constituted an integral part. The Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata is doing in its own way, slowly and diligently, the above-mentioned work of garnering and tabulating The time for estimating the value of the completed work is not yet. What this paper is meant to offer in the meanwhile is just a fleeting glimpse of the possibilities that can be eventually opened out, so that, in the fulness of time, we might be able to trace some of the earlier stages in the evolution of the Great Epic of India, and, as the Great Epic at all its stages generally has been a reflex of the cultural life of India, we would thereby be able to obtain a living record of the historical evolution, through the centuries, of the ideas and ideals of the peoples of Bhāratavarsa

Finally, it would be interesting in this context to discuss the question as to whether, in rushing upon Bhīsma in anger, Krsna did commit any breach of undertaking So far as the account of the third day is concerned, the breach of plighted word is without cavil, as there Krsna has the *Sudarśana* in his hand (55.86 93) But in the ninth-day account, which we have reason to believe was—barring the 67 lines—the original and only account of the incident once, Krsna leaps down with the charioteer's whip in hand (*pratodapāṇiḥ*), having the arm as the only weapon of attack (*bhujapraharaṇaḥ*) · cf. 102 53-54. Krsna was no doubt irritated; but in rushing upon Bhīṣma the way he does on the ninth day, Krsna might have intended to convey to Bhīsma the lesson that the cause for which Bhīsma had taken the vow of lifelong celibacy would be much better served by his dying now the warrior's death on the battlefield Bhīsma was, in fact, already a hundred years old. The royal line of his step-brother Vicitravīrya whose interest he had vowed to protect, had produced sons (Dhrtarāṣṭra and Pāndu) and grandsons (Duryodhana and his 99 brothers, and the five Pāndavas), who were then trying out their differences on the battlefield of Kuruksetra. Bhīsma is inwardly convinced that the Pāndavas had the right on their side. All his pleadings in the case remained unheeded. He also knew that Duryodhana, on whose side he had to fight as a matter of Ksatriya etiquette, cared very little for his help and had openly insulted him by suggesting that he might resign in favour of Karna. Was there any sense now in Bhīsma's wishing to live

yet a few years more? The right Āryan way ever had been to march boldly forth to meet death halfway, when all the good that you could do living had been already achieved. This in fact was the point of view that, in their overnight conference on the ninth day, Krsna and the Pāndavas must have placed before Bhīsma; and Krsna's marching weaponless against Bhīsma on the battle-field can be interpreted as a graphic prelude to that admonition. Eventually we know from the Epic itself that Bhīsma does come round to this view: cf. 6. 103. 66; 111. 12-15, 115. 31 40. The author responsible for the duplication of the incident on the third day misunderstands the real purpose of Krsna's march, and gives the Sudarśana in his hand, and the circumstance that Krsna would be thereby breaking his promise is explained in some still later accounts by the pretty story that, while Krsna had vowed not to wield any weapon during the Kaurava-Pāndava war, Bhīsma on his own part had staked his own position as a devotee of Krsna upon his ability to make the latter break his vow; and, as is usual in a tustle between the God and his devotee, the latter wins.

SAMUDRA GUPTA'S CONQUEST OF KOṬṬŪRA

BY

B. A. SALETORE

In this paper I propose to identify one of the conquests of Samudra Gupta mentioned in his famous Allahabad Pillar Inscription. This important record contains the following passage—

" Whose (*i. e.* Samudra Gupta's) great good fortune was mixed with, so as to be increased by (his) glory produced by the favour shewn in capturing and then liberating Mahendra of Kośala, Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra, Mantarāja of Kerala (Karāla) Mahendra of Pistapura, Svāmidatta of Kottūra on the hill, Damana of Erandapalla Visnugopa of Kāñcī (and other monarchs mentioned with their capitals). " [1]

The above conquests refer to what are called the Daksiṇāpatha conquests of Samudra Gupta I shall confine myself to the fifth conquest mentioned in the above list, *viz*, " Svāmidatta of Kottūra on the hill " as given by Fleet. He identified Kottūra with either Kailāsa Kotta (Lat. 19° 14' N, Long 83° 36 E) or with Kottūr in the Coimbatore district (Lat. 10° 32" N ; Long. 73° 2 E) [2] Smith conjectured thus—" Kottūra may be identified with the Pollachi sub-division of the Coimbatore district of the Madras Presidency. The beryl mines of Padiyur, which were famous in the Roman world at the beginning of the Christian era, were probably included within the limits of the kingdom." [3]

[1] Fleet,, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum. Gupta Inscriptions*. pp 12-14.

[2] *Ibid*, p 7, n(3) Fleet wrote thus about the conquests - " The statement that Samudra Gupta conquered the above mentioned kings, need not be added literary, especially as it seems almost certain that the Gupta dominions were bounded on the south by the Narmadā. Nor need we even take it as a fact that he invaded their dominions " (Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, p. 280). Why Fleet should have been so sceptical about Samudra Gupta's conquests, one fails to understand ! The reason given by him, *viz*, that because Samudra Gupta's Empire was bounded on the south by the Narmadā, he could not have conquered the places to the south of that river, is altogether unintelligible. But in his *Gupta Inscription* Fleet rectifies some of his earlier errors.

[3] Vincent Smith, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1897*, p. 29.

Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar denies the identification of Smith without himself giving us any definite clue. He writes thus—" Kottūru or Kottura may be one of the several places of name in the same region (*i. e*, Pistapuram) without going so far as Coimbatore to find a place answering to the name ". [1] Jayaswal merely said that Kottūra may be one of the two districts in Gānjām with a hill fortress, the other being Mahendragiri.[2]

The identification of Kottūra mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription with either Kailāsa Kotta or with Kottūra in the Coimbatore district or with Pollachi in the same district, as proposed by Fleet and Smith, cannot be accepted for the following reasons: (a) The Coimbatore district is too far removed from the entire region mentioned in the inscription, namely the Pistapura–Erandapalle–Kāñcī sector. If Samudra Gupta had really gone as far as the Coimbatore district, which lies to the south of Mysore, there would have been some reference in the inscription to any of the principalities that lay between Kāñcī and Coimbatore. Since there is no reference of this kind, it is evident that the Gupta conqueror did not go as far as Coimbatore to the south. (b) To have attracted the attention of that great warrior, Kottūra must have been a place of prominence either as a military stronghold or as the capital of a kingdom. There is no evidence that either Kailāsa Kotta or Kottūru or Pollāchi in the Coimbatore district was ever a place of any any importance in any period of Indian history.

Hence we have to turn elsewhere in order to identify the hill-fortress of Kottūra mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription. I must confess that both Fleet and Smith were correct when they assumed that it ought to be somewhere in Karnātaka. For the name is Kannada. In fact, there are at least three Kottūrus in Karnātaka with which one may be tempted to

---

1 S. K. Ayyangar, *Studies in Gupta History*, p. 27.

2 Jayaswal, *History of India*, p. 137. Dr. D. C. Sirkar conjectures thus that the state mentioned in the ,Allahabad Pillar inscription, which " may be conjecturally assigned to the Kaliṅga region," are Kurāla, Koṭṭūra, Piṣṭapura, Eraṇḍapalle, Avamukta and Devarāṣṭra. (Sirkar, *Successors of the ' Sātavāhanas in Eastern Deccan*, p. 67). Dr. Sirkar's; conjectures are no better than those of Drs. Ayyangar and Jayaswal.

identify the Kottūra mentioned above. There is Kottūru in Bairakūru *hobli* in the Kolar district of the Mysore State: another Kottūru in the Tondebhāvi *hobli* also in the Kolar district, and a third Kottūru in the Cintāmaṇi *hobli* also in the same district. I am not inclined to identify the Kottūra mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription with any of these three places in the Kolar district, because they do not seem to have been at any time either capitals of kingdoms or military strongholds The epigraphs discovered in these places merely show that they were ordinary localities of average importance. Thus in Kottūru in the Bairakūru *hobli*, a stone inscription recording an ordinary gift of paddy by an official called the Illustrious Mallana to a citizen named Vīrappa has been found.[1] At Kottūru in the Tondebhāvi *hobli* a damaged inscription records the gift of land by a high Vijayanagara official called Kōnappaya Deva Mahārāya, the Governor of Penugonda, to the temple of the gods Tiruvengalanātha and Aubalesvara in A. D. 1546, during the reign of the Emperor Sadāsiva Rāya.[2] At Kottūru in the Cintāmani *hobli*, has been found a stone inscription dated only on the 30th lunar day of the dark half of Kārttika of the cyclic year Kālāyukta (and hence not verifiable), but of the reign of the Vijayanagara Emperor Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great, registering the gift of land below the tank in the village of Kottūru (*Kottūru kereya kelage*) for the services of the god Tiruvengalanātha of Ālembādi, by Kāmappa Nāyaka under orders from the Mahāmandaleśvara Vīrappa Odeyar[3] In none of these records is there any evidence to show that the Kottūrus in the Kolār district were of any military or political importance[4]

---

[1] *Mysore Archaeological Report for 1923*, p. 65.

[2] *Ibid for 1925*, p. 75

[3] *Ibid for 1926*, pp. 73–74

[4] There are other Koṭṭūras in the Tamil land. For example, there is Koṭṭūru in Nenmalaināḍu, a sub-division of Rajendracoḷavalanāḍu, now in the Tanjore district, Madras Presidency. An incomplete record of the Cola king Rājādhirāja III mentions a gift of land in that village to the local deity (Rangacharya, *A Topographical List of Inscriptions in the Madras Presidency* II, Tj. 480, p. 1291). This place contains many records none of which refer to any fort. They are entirely benedictory epigraphs dated in the twelfth century A. D., relating to the local temple of Koluṇḍi-

(*continued on the next page*)

But this is not the case with another place of the same name with which I identify the Kottūra mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription. This is Kottūra in the Kudligi tālukā, Bellary district, Madras Presidency, which satisfies the three essential conditions necessary for its identification with Koṭṭūra of the Allahabad Pillar Inscriptions, *viz.*, that it was in Karnātaka, that it was near to the Kāñci–Pistapuram–Erandapaḷḷe sector, and that it was the capital of a kingdom with traditions of greatness extending over at least six centuries. It is called Kottūru in some records and Kottūra in others. In fact, so late as the sixteenth century, as will be seen in the course of this paper, while examining the Vijayanagara records, it is called consistently Kottura exactly as in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription.

It must be admitted that for the present we are in the dark as to the history of Kottūra for some ages immediately after the age of Samdura Gupta But in the eleventh century it figures as one of the conquests of a well-known Cola monarch I refer to the famous Tamil king Rājendra Cola II, also called Kulottunga Cola I, who ruled from A. D. 1070 till about 1118.[1] In a fragmentary stone inscription found in the Durgā temple at Agara, Yeḷandur tāluka, Mysore State, and bearing two regnal dates (the 12th and the 34th years) of the king's reign, corresponding to A. D 1081 and 1103 respectively, we have the following information that the king, when still a *yuvarāja*,

---

(*continued from the previous page*)

śvara (Rangacharya, *ibid*, Tj. 480–502, pp 1291–1294). There is another Koṭṭūru in the Chinglepat District, where records of the Cola King Kulottuṅga III, referring to a former gift by a Śambhuvarāya to the local deity at Koṭṭūru, have been found (Rangacharya, *ibid*, I Cg. 380, p. 367). In a record dated in the 5th year of the Cola King Rajendradeva (A. D. 1052–1063), it is called Colavidyādhara caturvedimangalam (Rangacharya, Cg. 1152, p 462) Another Kottūru is located in the Ambaranāḍu, a sub-division of Colamaṇḍala, in a record of the Cola King Vīrarājendra Coladeva. (Rangacharya, *ibid*, Cg. 1153, p. 63). A still another Koṭṭūru is mentioned in a record of King Rājādhirāja II (Rangacharya, *ibid*, Ct. 337, p. 517). For a Koṭṭūru in the Kistna District, as mentioned in a record dated A. D 1576–7, see Rangacharya, *ibid*, II, Kt. 702A, p. 885. In the Pudukottai State there is another Koṭṭūru which is mentioned in a record of Kulottunga Cola Deva I (Rangacharya, *ibid* III. Pd 41. p. 1626). And for another Koṭṭūru in the Travancore State, see *ibid*, III, p. 1696.

[1] Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 84.

wedded for the first time to the brilliant goddess of victory by his heroic deeds at Sakkaragottam (Cakrakottam in the Bastar State in Central India), captured troops of elephants at Vairagaram. that, having spurred his war-steed, he unsheathed his sword and displayed the strength of his arms, and put to flight the army of the kings of Kontala (Kuntala), who were armed with sharp lances, and put on the garland of victory over the Northern region (here follow his other conquests): that he was pleased to take possession of the pearl fisheries, the Podiyal mountain where the three forms of Tamil flourished, the middle Sayyim (Sahya) where the furious rutting elephants were captured and Kanni, and to establish settlements of people on all sides (in the conquered country) including Kottāru, so that all the heroes of the western hill-country ascended to high heaven while the Kungalars (the Kongas of Konganād) became scattered, etc.[1]

In the above list, although Kottāru is mentioned after the pearl fisheries of the south and after the Podiyal mountain, yet it is essentially located in the western Sahya region which is precisely the geographical position in which we find Kottūra in the Bellary district. The fact that it is mentioned as one of the conquests of king Rājendra Cola II shows that in the first half of the eleventh century, Kottūra was an important military centre.

That in addition it was also an important cultural centre is proved by a stone inscription found in front of the ruined Kallesvara temple at Kottūra itself. It is dated in the Cālukya-Vikrama era 36, Nandana, Vaiśākha, śu. 3, Bṛhaspati, and Uttarāyana, corresponding probably to A D. 1112, April, 1 Monday, the week-day not corresponding. It refers to the reign of Western Cālukyan monarch Tribhuvanamalla, who is identified with Vikramāditya VI, and who ruled from A D. 1076 till 1126.[2] It mentions the Mahāmandaleśvara Tribhuvanamalla Pāṇḍyadeva as ruling over Nonabavādi (Noḷambavādi) 32,000, and the Mahāmandaleśvara Ghattiayarasa of the Kadamba family as ruling over the Kōgaḷi 500 Province. The latter official made a gift of

[1] *Mysore Archaeological Report for 1917*, pp. 42-43; Rice, Mysore & Coorg, p. 93.

[2] Rice, *ibid*, p. 73.

land (specified), after washing the feet of the teacher Amṛtarāśi Panditadeva, for the services of the god Rāmeśvara of Kottūra and for feeding the ascetics. The epithet used in connection with Kottūra is noteworthy :— it is called *śrī* (the illustrous,) (and) original Kottūra (*śrī Kottūra mūlasthānam*). The donor, I may add, has a string of titles, one of which is the following *Ucchaṅgi-devi-labdha-vara-prasādam* (He who had secured the boon from the goddess [of] Ucchangi). [1]

We have now to show that *Kottūra* was the capital of a province. This is proved by a stone inscription found in the Pampāpati svāmi temple at Bennehalli, Harapanahalli tāluka, in the same Bellary district. The date of the record is irregular, but it refers to A D. 1148, April the 20th, Tuesday, the week-day Monday as well as the Solar eclipse and the Uttarāyana-samkrānti given in the record not corresponding The monarch mentioned in it is the Western Cālukya Jagadekamalladeva (II), whose other name was Permma, and who ruled from A. D 1138 till 1150. [2] His Mahāmandaleśvara Jagadekamalladeva Vīra Pāṇḍyadeva was ruling over the Noḷambavādi 32,000 Province from his capital of Ucchangi. He granted the village of Bennaganūru (location given) to the Mahāpradāna Vatsarāja to be granted to the temple of the god Svayambhūdeva of the village. We are informed that at this time king Nācideva of the Kadamba family ruled over the Kottūru 12 and the Kogali 500 Provinces from his capital of Kottūru (*intu negertiegum pogartiegum tāne Janmabhūmi yamb-ī-Koṭṭūr-panneraḍuman Kogali-ainūruman.*) [3] Here was, therefore, Kottura the capital of the two Provinces of Kottūru 12 and Kōgali 500, and the " Homeland of Fame and Renown, " in the middle of the twelfth century. We may note incidentally that the larger division called Kogaḷi 500 included within itself the smaller division called Kottūru 12.

In order to find out the truth of the above eulogy given to Koṭṭūru as the " Homeland of Fame and Renown," we have to

---

1 *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. IX, P I. No. 187 pp 181-182 , *319 of 1925*.

2 Rice *Mysore and Coorg*, p. 73.

3 *S. I. I.*, IX, P. I., No. 251, pp. 260-262. The Kogali 500 Province is now represented by the Harapanahalli and Hūvinahaḍagaḷli talukas of the Bellary, District. Rangacharya, *op. cit.*, I, p. 294.

ascertain as to when the larger political division called Kōgali 500 came into existence. In other words, we have to find out the antiquity of the Kōgali 500 Province itself. This Province may be dated, as will be shown later on in this paper, to at least the fifth century A. D. But from the ninth century onwards it figures prominently in epigraphs. Thus a stone inscription found in front of the Venkateśadeva temple at Mēvundī, Mundaragi Petha, Dharwar district, and dated Śaka 818, Naḷa Kārttika, śu. 5 Monday corresponding to A. D 897, October the 3rd Monday, mentions the Rāstrakūta monarch Akālavarsa, Krsna II, who ruled from A. D 939 till 968.[1] Under him was a Mahāsāmanta, whose name is lost, but who belonged to the Yādava dynasty, and who was placed over the Kōgali 500 and the Māseyavādi 140 Provinces. He constructed a temple of Keyagesvara at Meḷivīdu which is called a capital (*rājadhāni*).[2] This high official was no other than the Mahāsāmanta Kuppayarasa, who really held charge of the Puligere 300 Province in addition to the two divisions mentioned above.[3] Governor Śobhanarasa also possessed Kōgaḷi under him, in addition to Banavāsi 600, Belvoḷa 300, Purigere 300, Kundūru 500, and Kukkanūru 30 Provinces, in the tenth century [4]

The Kōgali 500 division passed under the Mahāsāmanta Bijja, who governed it under the Rāstrakūta king Nityavarsa Indra Ballaha III in Śaka 844, Citrabhānu, Bhādrapada Tuesday, full moon, which corresponds but for the week-day, which happens to be Monday, to A. D 922, September the 9th.[5] It is obviously the same Mahāsāmanta with the title of *Birudara Rotta*, who is said to be ruling over the Kōgali 500 division under the same monarch, in an undated record found close to the Kallesvara temple at Bāgali, Harapanahaḷḷi tāluka, Bellary district[6] Kōgali

[1] Rice. *Op. Cit*, p.87.

[2] *S. I I.* IX, P. I., No 22, p 13

[3] Krisnamacharlu, *S I. I. IX, P. I*. Intr p. v. For another copy of the same record in characters of the twelfth century A. D., see *ibid*, No. 30, p. 17.

[4] *Epigraphia Indica* IV, pp, 206-300, *S. I. I.* IX, P. I, Intr. p. viii.

[5] *S. I I. ibid*, No. 57, p. 32. See also No. 58, page *ibid*.

[6] *S. I. I. ibid*, No. 59, p, 33.

500 is called Kōgaḷināḍu in Śaka 853 (A. D. 931-2) under the official Ayyapayya, in the reign of the Rāstrakūta king Govinda IV. [1] In A. D. 956 it was governed by the Mahāsāmanta Rottayya, under the Rāstrakūta king Akālavarsa Kannara (Krsna III). [2]

Kōgali 500 remained in tact in the age of the Western Cālukyas of Kalyāṇi, who had overthrown the Rāsṭrakūtas in A. D. 973. It was governed in A D. 987 along with Kisukādu 70 by the Mahāsāmanta Ayatavarmā, in the reign of the Western Cālukya monarch Āhavamalla, Tailapa Nūrmadi. [3] The Mahāsāmanta's real name was Ādityavarmā, and he continued to be the governor of Kōgali 500 till A. D. 993 We may mention that in that year he had under him also Saundatti 12. [4]

The notices of Kōgaḷi in the epigraphs of the eleventh century are more conspicuous In the reign of the Western Cālukyan monarch Jagadekamalla, Jayasimha II, Kōgaḷi 500, along with a number of other divisions, was placed under his feudatory Udayādityarasa in A. D. 1018. [5] It continued to be under the same feudatory till A. D. 1032, when his second son Pallava Permmādi was made its governor. [6] From A. D. 1032, till 1048 Pallava Parmmādi governed the Kōgali 500 division first under the monarch Jayasimha II, and then under the latter's successor Someśvara I. [7] One of the records dated A. D. 1045 indicates the religious importance of the province. We are informed in this record that there was a prominent Kālāmukha *matha* called *Simhaparṇṣe* at Kōgali for the maintenance of which an official called Ghattiyarasa made a specified gift of land. [8]

Under the same monarch Somesvara I we find in A. D. 1050 the feudatory Narasingadeva of the Pallava family as governor of Kogali 500. [9] In A. D. 1054 it was still under Narasingadeva,

---

[1] *S. I.I. IX. P.I.*, No. 61, p. 34. [2] *Ibid*, No. 66, p. 38. [3] *Ibid*, No. 75, p. 46.

[4] *Ibid*, No. 76, 77, pp. 46–47. [5] *Ibid*, No. 80, p. 50.

[6] *Ibid*, Nos. 85, 87, 90, 94, 96, pp. 56–58.

[7] *Ibid.*, I, Nos. 85, 87, 88, 89, pp. 56–60 *Epigraphia Carnatica*, XI, Dg. 126, p. 74, *S. I. I. ibid*, No 94, p. 64, No. 99, p. 69, No. 101, p. 70, No. 104, pp. 78–79; *Ep. Car.* XI. Dg. 19, p. 29, *Ep. Car.* VII He., 107, p. 77.

[8] *S. I. I., ibid*, No. 101, op. cit. For the religious (*i. e.*, Lingayat and Jaina) importance of Koṭṭūra, and, therefore, of Kōgaḷi, read *Bellary Gazetteer*, I. pp. 290–291.

[9] *S. I. I. ibid*, No. 107, p. 82.

whose son Kumāra Corayadeva was governing the Ucchangi 30 division.[1] That Kōgali was also a Jaina centre is proved by a record dated Śaka 977 (A. D. 1055) of the same monarch Someśvara I. This epigraph is doubly interesting. Firstly, because it informs us that in Kōgalı there was a Jaina temple (*basadı*) which imparted education, and that the Jaina teacher Indrakīrti made a specified gift of land in Ittage, a suburb of Kōgali, for imparting education at the *basadi.* Secondly, we are told that that *basadı* at Kōgali had been formerly constructed by the king Durvinīta (*idu Durvınītanindam modalōl basadi nāḍamattara ghaleyam vıdıtayaś-Indrakīrttıgalu-udıtodıtam āge māḍıdar-Kōgaliyoḷ*).[2] Since the king Durvinīta mentioned in this record could have been no other than the well-known Ganga king of that name, about whose patronage to Jainısm I have given ample proof elsewhere, and since he lived ın the fifth century A. D.,[3] we are to assume that Kōgali, and therefore, its capital Kottūru, were already prominent in the fifth century A. D. This brings us to within one century from the age of the Emperor Samudra Gupta.

The political and religious ımportance of Kōgalı is further proved by a record dated A. D 1062, when the same moarch Someśvara I was ruling. But the feudatory over Kōgali 500 was now Visnuvardhana Mahārāja. who governed the entire Nolambavādi 32,000 Province. The mutilated record that gives us this detail also tells us that on that date, all the ministers and the *mahāprabhus* of Kōgalinād and the Kadambaligenād (*śrīmat-arasara-samasta-pradhānar-Kōgalınāḍ...vunḍabalıgenāḍ-prabha...*), and with a number of leading Jaina and Brahman citizens, farmers of the five *mathasthānas*, the 96,000 (Province) Representatives, made a grant of land to the Ūrodeya (Collector of the District) Māranayya.[4]

---

[1] *Ep. Car.*, XI. Jl. 10, p. 85.

[2] *S. I I. ıbıd.*, No. 117, p. 92. [3] Saletore, *Medıaeval Jaınısm*, pp. 19-23

[4] *E. Car.* XI, Dg 143, pp 77-78 Kōgali 500 figures in another mutilated record dates A. D. 1058 under a feudatory called Ganga Permmāḍi Brahmadevarāja, who was evidently no other than Vinayādıtya mentioned above. *Ibıd*, Dg. 153, pp. 79-80.

The undated Kōgali *basadi* record of the reign of the king Trailokyamalladeva is evidently to be assigned to this age ; but I cannot make out how the editor of this epigraph came to write about the *nakharas* (citizens) of Kōgali.[1] This division continued to be under Visnuvardhana Mahārāja Vijayāditya in A. D. 1065[2] This feudatory, who is called the Lord of Vengi, was governor of Kōgaḷi in A. D. 1066.[3]

In A D 1068 in the reign of the next Western Cālukyan monarch Someśvara II, Bhuvanaikamalla, the governor placed over Kōgali 500 was the Nolamba Pallava Jayasingadeva.[4] Three years later in the reign of king Someśvara's famous brother Vikramāditya VI, Tribhuvanamalladeva, this monarch made a gift of the village of Kotiganūru in Kōgali 500 for the services of the god Kalideva, and for the Kālāmukha ascetics in the *matha* of Lakulesvara Pandita of Pūvina-Padangale. This record is interesting because it gives the geographical location of Kōgali 500 thus—*Tungabhadrā-nadiya tenkana Kōgali-ainūara-bahya.*[5] This fact that Kōgali 500 was on the southern side of the Tungabhadrā confirms my statement that that division, with its capital Kottūra, was essentially within the limits of Karnātaka

We may pause here before proceeding further with the history of Kōgali 500 and its capital Kottūra, in order to understand the reference to the latter place in one of the inscriptions of the great Tamil monarch Rājendra Cola II It is precisely because Kogali lay on the southern side of the Tungabhadrā, and to the north of the Tamil country, that its capital Kottūra is said to be in the record dated A. D. 1070 already cited above, as having been in the Western hilly country. Further, it is because of its political, religious, and cultural importance that, as related above, it is styled in A. D. 1148 as the " Homeland of Fame and Renown ".[6]

---

1 *S I I* IX, No. 130, pp. 112-113
2 *Ibid.*, No. 128, pp. 109-10.
3 *Ibid*, No. 129, pp. 111-112.
4 *Ibid*, No. 132, p 114.
5 *Ibid*, No. 135, pp. 118-119, ll, 9-10

6 I am inclined to believe that quite a number of places in the Tamil country mentioned in an earlier context in this paper, came to be called Koṭṭūru after the capture of the famous capital of Kogali 500 by the well-known Tamil monarch Rajendra Coḷa II.

The importance of Kōgali 500 is further proved by another record dated A D. 1108. This is however a very much damaged inscription. From it we gather that in the reign of the same Western Cālukya monarch Vikramāditya Tribhuvanamalladeva, the great minister, bearing the burden of whole kingdom, possessed of the three forms of government, the Pērggade Rācamayya Nāyaka held the office of Pērggade of the Kōgali 500 and the Kadambalige 1,000 Provinces [1]

We lose sight of Kōgali for about forty years, but in A D. 1148-9 in the reign of the Western Cālukyan monarch Jagadekamalla II, Permma, as related above, when the feudatory Jagadekamalla Vīra Pāṇḍyadeva was governing the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province, from Ucchangi, the Kadamba lord Nācideva ruled over the Kottūru 12 and the Kōgali 500 divisions from the capital of Kottūru.[2] But in the reign of the same monarch, the same feudatory governed the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province from the capital of Ucchangi. The mutilated record dated A. D. 1150 which gives us this information, contains further proof that Kōgali, and, therefore, Kottūru, was within the limits of Karnātaka. For it informs us that to the face of Lady Wealth of Kuntala, Kōgali was the forehead mark (*śrīmat-Kuntalavenbud-ondu vilasat-Lakṣmīkaram Kogali-nāḍ-adarkke tilakam*).[3] Since Kuntala, as is well-known, was always within the boundaries of Karnātaka, and sometimes identical with it, we may reasonably assume that the scribe of the above record meant by Kuntala no other land but Karnāṭaka

That Kottūru was undoubtedly the capital of Kōgali 500 and of Koṭṭūr 12 divisions, is proved by a record wrongly dated in Śaka 1085 (which is evidently an error for 1075) (A. D 1154, January the 16th Friday, the week-day not corresponding), which informs us that Nācidevarasa of the Kadamba family governed the Kōgali 500 and the Kottūru 12 divisions from his capital of Kottūra (*Nāci-dēvarasaru Kōgaliya-aimūrumam Koṭūru-panneraḍumum duṣṭa-nighraha-śiṣṭha-pratipalānadind-āldu Koṭū-*

[1] *Ep Car.* XI, Jl. 12, pp. 85-86
[2] *S I. I* IX. No. 250, pp. 260-2, *op cit*.
[3] S. I. I. *ibid*, No. 257, pp. 272-273.

ralu-sukha-sankathā-vinodadim – rājyam – gėyyuttam – ire).[1] This Kadamba scion was evidently the same official we saw above under the monarch Jagadekamalla II. Nācideva is mentioned as the grand-father of the Mahāmandaleśvara Vīra Jagadala Bammidevarasa, who is represented as governing over the same region in A D 1212, evidently in the reign of the Hoysala ruler Ballāla II, although the latter is not mentioned in the epigraph For our purpose we may note that the feudatory Nācideva is spoken of as having hailed from Kottūru itself (*Mahāmaṇḍalesvaram Koṭṭūra Nācidevarasam*)[2] The high praise given to Kōgali 500 in the next year A. D. 1213 confirms my statement that that division was a part of Karnātaka In this damaged record we have the following—That to the country Kuntala Kōgali was a mirror, and to the Pāndyadeśa a shining head jewel (*Kuntala-dēśakke-idu kannaḍi...... Pāṇḍya-viśayamam sogayipudu.. ant-eseva-Pāṇḍya-viśayakke-int-idu ramaṇī mukuram-āgi Kōgaliya-ainūrumam*).[3]

We traverse almost half a century before we come across the next reference to Kōgali and Kottūru. By this time this part of Karnātaka had passed under the suzerainty of the Yādavas of Devagiri. In A. D 1276 during the reign of the Yādava king Rāmacandradeva, the great nobleman and the master of the hill-forts, Khande Rāya Hemmādi Deva made a grant of the Kottūru-vrtti to some one whose name is effaced in the record.[4]

The ancient prestige of Kōttūru was maintained in the Vijayanagara age In a royal grant dated A. D. 1354 of king

[1] This inscription refers to the reign to the Western Cālukyan monarch Vikramāditya VI, but falls within the reign of Trailokyamalla, Taila III. (*S I. I ibid.*, No 264, pp. 279-280)

[2] *S I. I. op. cit.*, No. 331, p. 350.

[3] *Ibid*, No. 332, p 351. It may be observed here that Beṇnekallu was not the chief town in Kōgali 500, as maintained by the Editor of the Kalleśvara temple record, but only the chief *village*. For the original runs thus—*Kōgaliya-ainūraam Beṇnekallu-hannaradakkam-mukhyavād Beṇṇkal-grāma-dalu.* This record is dated A. D 1226. *S. I. I., ibid.* No. 343, pp. 362-366.

[4] *Ep car* XI, Jl. 30, p 87. It cannot be made out whether Koṭṭurahaḷḷi which figures in a record dated A. D. 1287 (Ep. *Car.* VII, Sk. 312, p 153) was the same as the Koṭṭūra discussed in these pages. Perhaps it was not, because it is called a *halli* or village, while the Koṭṭūra of our record was always the capital of a division.

Bukka Rāya, that ruler is represented as having given to Rāmanna Jyoisa (descent stated), the astrologer of Hariharadevapura, the village of Mittaliganakatte or Mittaligonakotte, which the king had ordered to be built within the limits of Harihara-devapura in the Ucchangivēpthe belonging to the Kotturu-cāvadi [1] The word *cāvaḍi* or hall used in this connection is noteworthy, in as much as it suggests that even in the first half of the fourteenth century, Kotturu continued to be one of the provincial seats of the Vijayanagara Empire.

The political importance of Kotturu is still further proved by another record of A. D 1382 of the reign of the next Vijayanagara monarch Harihara II. This ruler granted the village of Śankaripura in the Hariharasīme in the Ucchangivēnthe belonging to the Kotturu-cāvadi within the Vijayanagara kingdom, to the learned Brahman Lingarasa (descent stated) [2] In a record dated A. D. 1406 of the reign of the Vijayanagara king Deva Rāya II, three villages of Jigale, Kunduru and Horasandra are said to have been attached to the town of Bhānuvati which belonged to the Kotturu-sīme and the Ucchangivēnthe [3]

The Vijayanagara monarchs, as I have amply proved elsewhere, [4] always maintained the traditional administrative divisions of the land This explains why Kotturu-cāvadi still continued to figure in the Vijayanagara records In A. D 1516 in the reign of the great Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya, a minister was placed over Koṭṭūru. His name was Aruha-Timmana Nāyaka In that year he granted the village of Dannāyakanapura for the charity water-lift at Soge. [5] Nonabanavasikere is said to have been in the *vaḷita* of Kotturu in A. D. 1527, when the high official called Rāyasada Nārāyanappa was placed over Kotturu. [6] Three years later (1530) in the reign of Acyuta Deva, Kotturu again figures. The record that gives us this information tells us that the village named Baḷḷāpura, which was granted as a gift, was situated in Hariharasīme belonging to Pāṇḍyanāḍ which was a

[1] *Ep. Car.* XI, *Dg.* 67, p. 63.
[2] *Ibid*, XI, Dg. 68, p. 67. [3] *Ibid*, Dg. 108, p. 71.
[4] Saletore, *Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire*, II. *passim*.
[5] *S. I. I.* IX P. II. No 503, p. 516. [6] *Ibid*, No. 522, p. 538.

subdivision of Uochangivēnthe which itself formed a part of Kottūru-cāvadı[1]

In the reign of Emperor Sadāsiva Rāya the references to Kottūru are copious. An undated stone inscription found at Nandihallı, Hadagaṇahalli tāluka, Bellary district, registers a gift made by that Emperor of the village of Volalugundi Bhayirapura, surnamed Gopināthapura, in Kottūru-sīme to the temples of Bañjeśvara and Gopinātha at Timmalāpura, which was an agrahāra set up by Rāmapayya.[2] The barbers of Bagulı in Kotturu-sīme in A. D. 1547, during the reign of the same monarch, were exempted from the payment of certain specified taxes by that Vijayanagara ruler.[3] In the same year Bemma Nāyaka granted the village of Amaragere in Rangapura-sthala situated in Kottūru-sīme, as a gift to Varunakaṇṭa Odeyar.[4] The royal order of A. D. 1547 exempting the barbers from paying certain taxes, was extended in January to the barbers of Kottūru-sīme, and in February of the same year to the barbers of Maiduru also in the Kottūru-sīme.[5] Krsnappa Nāyaka was governing over the Kottūru 30 division which belonged to the Kōgali province in 1550, also in the reign of the same monarch Sadāsiva Rāya.[6] In the record dated A. D. 1551 we are informed that Kotturu-sīme had been granted to Krsnapa Nāyaka himself. This record clearly proves that the ancient administrative divisions were in tact under Vijayanagara For it informs us that Koṭṭūru-sīme formed a part of the Kōgali-vēnthe which was a sub-division of Pāndyanādu which belonged to the Hastināvatı-valita (*Hastınāvatı-valıtada Pāṇḍyanāḍa-valagana Kōgalıya-vēnthe-*

[1] *Ep Car* XI. Dg 28, p. 38

[2] *464 of 1914*, Rangacharya, *op cit*, I, By 224, p 288, *S I I*, IX, P. II. No. 682, p 677

[3] *S. I I*, IX P. II, No 622, p. 627.

[4] *S I I.*, IX P. II, No 626, pp. 629-630.

[5] *Ibid*, Nos. 628, 629, pp 631. In view of all these records, the insertion of the word Koṇṭenura in the record dated A D 1548 by the Editors (*S. I. I.* IX. P. II, No. 630, p. 632) should be changed to Koṭṭūru. For "Kuṇṭenūra-sīme" is not mentioned in inscriptions; and there could not have been two *Sīmes*-Koṭṭūr-*sīme* and Kuṇṭenūru-sīme in the same *valita* of Kōgaḷı almost in the same year.

[6] *Ibid*, No. 640, p. 638. See also *71 of 1904*; Rangacharya, *op. cit.* I. By. 263, p. 294.

yake-saluva Kottūru-simeya).[1] This territorial division is repeated in detail in 1580 when, some time after the great battle of Rākṣasa-Tangadi, the Vijayanagara Emperor Tirumala Rāya was ruling from Anagondi, and his officer Vādi Nāyaka exempted the shepherds of Koṭṭūru-sīme from a tax on their sheep.[2]

When the capital was transferred from Anegondi to Penugonda, Koṭṭūru was naturally transferred to the Penugondā rājya. This is evident from references to it in the seventeenth century records which mention Kottūru as having been situated in the Penugonda-rājya. Thus a copper plate inscription of the last Vijayanagara ruler Śrī Ranga Rāya, dated in A. D. 1665, March the 15th, describes Kottūru-sīme as having been a part of Penugonda-rājya.[3] Kottūru-sīme is said to have been a sub-division of Kōgali-vēnthe in a paper *sanad* of A. D. 1785, December the 17th, granted by the Keladi king Basavappa Nāyaka to the Śrngeri *guru* Sacchidānanda Bhāratī.[4] Kōgali mentioned in this record was evidently the same Kōgali the history of which has been outlined above.

The numerous records cited above prove beyond doubt that Kottūra was attached to the larger division of Ucchangi. This locality is one of the most famous hill-fortresses in Southern and Western Indian history. It had a glorious history behind it, and it was called by its other name Ucchaśrngi. It lies in the south-west of the Bellary district in the Harapanahalli tāluka, just near the Mysore border at Dāvanagere. It is in latitude 14° 34', and Long. 76° 7'.[5] Ucchangi figures as one of the provincial seats of the early Kadambas of Halasi.[6] It later on

---

[1] *S. I. I.* IX. P. II. No. 685, p. 677. It cannot be made out whether this is the same record of the same date, noticed first by Sewell (*Antiquities of Southern India*, I, p. 110), and then by Rangacharya (*op. cit.* I. By 433, p. 314).

[2] *S. I. I.* IX. P. II, No. 685, pp. 677-8.

[3] *My. Archl. Report for 1924*, p. 92. [4] *Ibid for 1933*, p. 233.

[5] There is another Ucchangidurga about 50 miles to the east by north from the Ucchangidurga of Bellary. This other Ucchangidurga lies three miles to the east of Molkālmūra in the Doḍḍeri tāluka of the Chitaldoorg district, Mysore State. (Fleet, *Dy., Kan. Dts.* p. 285, P. 285, n. 5). But this other Ucchangidurga does not seem to have been as famous as the more ancient hill-fortress in Harapanahaḷḷi tāluka.

[6] Rice, *Mys. Inscriptions*, p. XXXIX, *My. & Coorg*, p. 26, where Rice identifies it with the hill-fortress in Molkalmūru. See also Fleet, *ibid*, p. 285.

became the capital of the whole of the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province, under the well-known feudatory family of the Pāṇḍyas of Ucchangi.[1]

From the ninth century A. D., onwards the great Ucchangi hill-fortress figures in inscriptions. The Ganga king Mārasimha is credited with the capture of this impregnable fortress, as is related in the Āñjaneya temple stone inscription found at Karagada, in Belūr tāluka and dated in A D 971, Prajotpatti, Āsāḍha The ruler whom king Mārasimha defeated is called in that record merely Rājāditya (*Ucchangiya-kōteqe Rājādityana-kālaqike*).[2] In a later but mutilated record dated A D. 974, and found at Sravaṇa Belgola, we are informed that king Mārasimha[1] reduced to powder the hill-fortress of Ucchangi." In the same Sravaṇa Belgola record we have the important detail of the royal family to which Rājāditya belonged. Mārasimha, otherwise called *Gaṅga-cūḍāmaṇi*, we are informed in this record, "became a forest fire to the lion Rājāditya, the crest-jewel of the Cālukyas "[3] This fact of Rājāditya's having been a scion of the Cālukya royal house is to be borne in mind in our estimate of the identification of the royal family to which Svāmidatta, the contemporary of Samudra-Gupta belonged, as will be narrated towards the end of his paper

The Ucchangi hill-fortress continued to be important in the first half of the eleventh century A. D. This is proved by the stone inscription set up near the Tavakeśvarasvāmi temple at Ucchangi-durga itself in the Harapanahalli tāluka It belongs to the reign of the Western Cālukya ruler Āhavamalla, when his son the Vengimaṇḍaleśvara (Lord of Vengi) Visnuvardhana Vijayaditya ruled over the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province, and the latter's deputy Devappayya was placed over the division called Ucchangi 30. This record gives the following legendary origin of the hill-fortress .— That in the middle of the Kadambavādi-nāḍ there shone the mountain fortress of Ucchangi which in

---

[1] *Ep. Car.* VII, Intr. p. 26; *ibid* XI, Intr. p. 16 ff, *Mys and Coorg*, pp 58, 59, 76, 92, 100, 102.

[2] *My. Arch. Rept.* for 1911, p. 37; *Ep Car.* II., Intr. pp, 44 45, *ibid*, XV, No. 308, p. 79.

[3] *Ep. Car.* II, No. 59, p. 12.

the Kṛta *yuga* was called Meghanāda, because it had been the abode of a fiend (*rākṣasa*) called Meghanāda. In the Treta *yuga* it was the abode of Hiranyaka When he was slain by the god Nārāyaṇa, gold rained from heaven on this hill-fortress, and hence it was called Kanakagiri. In the Dvāpara *yuga* it was the abode of the great ṛṣi Uttanga, and hence it was called Uttanga-parvata And in the Kali *yuga* a Brahman maiden called Ucchangi and two others prayed to the god Īśvara and obtained a boon, and hence it was called Ucchangiparvata.[1]

The strategic importance of Ucchangi, and hence of Kottura, in the twelfth century is proved by the records pertaining to the well-known Hoysala House Its greatest ruler was king Viṣṇu-vardhana Bittigadeva, whose famous general was Ganga Raja I have already enumerated elsewhere the military achievements of this great commander[2] General Ganga Rāja must have conquered the great Ucchangi fortress in 1123, although the Śravana Belgola inscription dated in that year, and another inscription dated in 1131, attributed its conquest to king Viṣṇu-vardhana himself.[3]

The conquest of Ucchangi in the reign of that monarch (A. D 1111-1141) did not mean the annihilation of the ancient family that had ruled over that fortress In the reign of his grandson, king Ballāla II, who ruled from 1173 till 1220, its rulers again gave trouble to the Hoysala State This necessitated its reduction by king Ballala II Two records, both found in Śravana Belgola, give us valuable details of this conquest The record dated 1181 contains the following information—That when in the pride of his arm Odeyarasa was with great fury determined to fight, king Ballāla marched forth, and surrounding and besieging Ucchangi, whose peaks had been reduced to powder by the blows from the tusks of the groups of lordly elephants of his army, captured king Pāndya, together with his beautiful women, country, treasures, father, and group of horses. Laying siege to

[1] *S. I. I*, Nr. IX, 126, pp. 107-108

[2] See Saletore, *Mediaeval Jainism*, pp. 114, 116-119, 121-132, ff.

[3] *Ep. Car* II. No. 132, p. 143. But see the text of Nos. 240 and 384, pp. 102, 172, in order to be convinced that this conquest could have been the work only of Ganga Rāja.

Ucchaṅgi, which was for a long time considered impregnable to enemies, king Ballāla, a treasury of irresistible prowess, took the fort with ease and seized the kings Kāmadeva and the famous Odeya, and their treasures, women, and troops of horses.[1] The same facts relating to king Kāmadeva and Odeya are mentioned in the later record dated 1195.[2] We have to infer from the record of 1181 that the rulers of Ucchangi belonged to the Pāndya House, under whom the Cālukyas might have continued to govern

From whatever point of view we may look at Ucchangi, and, therefore, at Kottūra,– traditional, geographical, or political,– it is clear that it was in Karnātaka proper. This means that Samudra Gupta entered the north-eastern part of Karnātaka, and conquered the ruler of that region. Here we come across some difficulties which need clarification. I shall take the order of conquests as given in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription. It has been mentioned above that the conquest of Koṭṭūra is placed after the conquest of Pistapura and before that of Ērandapalle. Of these Pistapura was undoubtedly the modern Pithāpuram (12 miles north-east of Cocanada) in the East Godāvari district. It was the capital of ancient Kalinga[3] Whether we are to take the difficult passage in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription— "*Paistapuraka-Mahendragiri- Kauttūraka-Svāmidatta,*" along with Fleet, as referring to king Mahendra of Piṣṭapura,[4] or along with Dr. Bhandarkar and Mr. Ramachandramurty, as referring to a ruler called Mahendragiri,[5] is beside the point for the present, because we are concerned here with the order of the conquests in the Ērandapalle-Piṣṭapuram region.

1 *Ep Car* II No. 327, p 136 2 *Ibid*, No 335, p. 142

3 Allan, *Gupta Coins* p XXII, Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 300 (1924 ed).

4 Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p 7, (n 2), 13 Granting that we accept Fleet's interpretation that Kottūra was on the hill, it may be made to agree with the location of Koṭṭūra given above thus — That Koṭṭūra is spoken of as belonging to the fortress of Ucchaṅgi which was itself a hill-fortress. It may be remembered here that Kottūra is described in epigraphs as having formed a part of province (*vēṇṭhe*) of Ucchangi.

5 D. R. Bhandarkar, *Indian Culture*, II, pp. 761-762; V. S. Ramachandry Murty, *ibid*, III, pp. 230-231.

From Pistapuram Samudra Gupta marched in a south-westerly direction to Kottūra in the Bellary district, and then turned his attention to Ērandapalle. A discussion of the location of this latter place will convince us that Samudra Gupta had, indeed, entered the heart of the Deccan. Two views have been expressed concerning Ērandapalle Dr S K. Ayyangar and Prof. V. Rangacharya maintain that Erandapalle of the Allahabad Pillar inscription was no other than Ērandapalle in the Gāñjām district [1] The other view is that of Fleet, Allan, and Smith, who identify it with Erandoḷ in the Khandesh district. [2]

I am inclined to accept the latter view that Ērandapalle of the Allahabad Pillar inscription was no other than Ērandoḷ in the Khandesh district for the following reasons. If we agree to the idea that the scribe of the Allahabad Pillar inscription has mentioned the conquests of Samudra Gupta in some order, then, we cannot accept the view that the Ērandapalle of the Allahabad Pillar record was in the Ganjam district For, according to the latter view, it would mean that Samudra Gupta first conquered Pistapura, and then marched north-eastwards to the Ganjam district This would mean that he had left an enemy in the rear when he first struck at Pistapura We cannot credit Samudra Gupta with such a tactless blunder. What makes us assert this with confidence is the fact that if Samudra Gupta had really gone north-eastwards to the Ganjam district, the scribe of the record would have mentioned first Pistapura, next Ērandapalle, and then Koṭṭura But Kottura is placed *after* Pistapura and *before* Ērandapalle thereby justifying our assumption that Ērandapalle must have been located in a region which was geographically

---

[1] S K Ayyangar, *Studies in Gupta History*, p 39, C. P. of 4 of 1912-3, Rangacharya, A *Topographical List of Inscriptions in the Madras Presy*, III, pp 1674-1675 The late Dr K P. Jayaswal wrote thus about Damana of Erandapalle " and Damana of Erandapalle must have been a 'rāja' or ruler of the status of a district officer under Svāmidatta of Pistapura " (Jayaswal, *History of India*, p 37). This is one of the many conjectures which vitiates Dr Jayaswal's interesting work.

[2] Fleet, *J. R. A. S.* for 1898, pp. 368-9; Allan, *Gupta Coins*, pp. XXIII-XXIV, Smith, *E H I* pp 284 1914 ed), 301 (1924 ed.)

nearer to Kottura than to Pistapura. Ērandol in the Khandesh district is precisely such a place While we are in the dark as to the antiquity and importance of Ērandol, we may note that from this place in the Khandesh district, Samudra Gupta turned south-eastwards, and marching through a most difficult country, presented himself before Kāñcī (the modern Conjeevaram near Madras,) where ruled the Pallava king Visṇugopa whom he subjugated[1]

It must be admitted that with the available evidence, we do not know the reasons which prompted Samudra Gupta to turn south-eastwards from Ērandol to Kāñcī. All that we may hazard to point out is that the powerful Pallavas of Kāñcī, whose sway extended over a large part of the centre of the Madras Presidency, along the coast and in the interior might have been alarmed at the advance of Samudra Gupta, who had struck at Koṭṭūra, a vital part of Karnāṭaka

Now to the identity of the ruler Svāmidatta, it must also be confessed that we can likewise only conjecture. The name itself-Svāmidatta,-deserves some comment. There have been rulers whose names have ended in *datta* Thus, in the Ēraṇdmall Boar statue inscription assigned to the 5th century A D, the names Maheśadatta and Varāhadatta, obviously brothers, are mentioned[2] I do not think we could identify the Svāmidatta of the Allahabad Pillar inscription with a ruler of this family, because of the following reasons '—(a) Ērān, which lies eleven miles from Khurai (on the G. I. P.), in the Saugor district of the Central Provinces, is too far away from Kottura. (b) Although Ērān is very intimately connected with Samudra Gupta himself - an inscription of his having been found here, - yet we do not know whether any ruler of Ērān held sway over Kottura. (c) If a ruler of Ērān called Svāmidatta had really been subjugated by Samudra Gupta, this fact would have been men-

[1] Prof. Dubreuil denies that Sumudra Gupta ever entered the Tamil land. *The Pallavas*, p. 14 But he does not give any reason for arriving at this conclusion.

[2] Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey Report*, X, pp. 87 ff., Hiralal, *Catalogue of Inscriptions in the C. P. and Berar*, p. 48.

tioned either in the fragmentary Ērān pillar inscription which directly deals with Samudra Gupta, or in the inscription relating to Buddha Gupta,[1] or in the Ērān small Boar statue inscription mentioned above Since in none of these records is there the slightest reference to Svāmidatta's having been a ruler of Ērān, we have to reject this assumption

There is another royal family some rulers of which bore names that ended in *datta* This is the ancient royal family of Punnāta which I have outlined elsewhere[2] Two rulers of this family were called Nāgadatta (*circa* 280 A. D) and Ravidatta (*circa* 400 A. D) We could have said that Svāmidatta belonged to the Punnāta royal family, especially when we realise that after Ravidatta's time, the Punnāta House came to an end This assumption receives some support when we observe that Ravidatta's age (*circa* 400) comes very near Samudra Gupta's age (A. D 335–385).[3] But two objections violate this assumption. Firstly, there is nothing to show that the Punnāta rulers, whose capital lay to the extreme south of the modern Mysore State, ever held sway over the Bellary district in which Koṭṭūra was located And, secondly, the manner in which the Punnāta Royal House after Ravidatta came to an end, conclusively proves that we have to seek elsewhere than in the Punnāṭa history for the identity of the ruler called Svāmidatta. As I have shewn in my paper on the ancient Punnāta kingdom referred to above, that principality was subverted by the Ganga king Durvinita. If Svāmidatta had been a Punnāta ruler, and Samudra Gupta had subjugated him, we would have had some reference to the ancient Punnāṭa kingdom in some of the records of the Gupta monarch or of his successors Since no such reference is met with, we have to assume that Svāmidatta belonged to some other Karnātaka royal family.

Such an ancient family that was almost contemporaneous with Samudra Gupta was a branch of the Cālukyas, one of whose

---

[1] Fleet, *Gupta Ins.*, p. 18, Cunningham, *Archæological Survey Report*. X, p 89, Fleet, *ibid*, p Cunningham, *ibid*, p, 82, *J R A S*, VII. p. 633, *ibid* XXX, p. 17, ff. *ibid* XXXI, p. 1887, note.

[2] Saletore, *Indian Culture*, pp. 303–317,

[3] Allan, *Gupta Coins*, pp. XXXII–XXXIII.

early monarchs was called Svāmirāja. This ruler, who is said to have been victorious in eighteen battles, was killed by the Western Cālukya ruler of the main line by name king Mangalesa, as is related in the undated Nērūr grant of king Mangaleśa.[1] Of course the ruler Svāmirāja who lived in the latter half of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh century A. D., could never have been a contemporary of Samudra Gupta. But the point to be borne in mind is that in Karnātaka was an ancient line of the Cālukyas, one of whose rulers was called Svāmirāja. It is possible that when more records about this ancient line will be unearthed, we might perhaps have to take Svāmidatta, the contemporary of Samudra Gupta, as one of the predecessors of Svāmirāja, who belonged to this early branch of the Cālukya House. All that we may assert for the present is that Kottūra which Samudra Gupta conquered was essentially a Karnātaka centre, and that its ruler was in all likelihood a Karnātaka king.[2]

---

[1] Fleet, *Dy. Kan Dts*, pp 347-349

[2] In the history of the Gangas, too, we come across names of rulers, ending in *datta* Thus kings Gangādatta, Bhagadatta, and Śrīdatta are mentioned. (Rice, *My. & Coorg*, p 38) It is too premature to suggest that Svāmidatta belonged to the ancient Ganga House or to the Kadamba royal family which, as mentioned elsewhere, had Ucchangi as one of its provincial capitals (Fleet, *Dy Kan. Dts*, p 285) An unidentified Cālukya king called Parahitarāja is mentioned in a vīragal assigned by Fleet to about the 9th century A D The place called Kōṭūr where this record was found, lies about 20 miles in a north-westerly direction from Saundatti, the chief town of the Parasgad tāluka of the Belgaum district, Bombay Presidency. (Fleet, *Indian Antiquary*, XX, p. 69 ff) Excepting this *viragal* found near the temple of Paramānanda, there is no other record of any importance discovered in this neighbourhood. This Kōṭūr is not mentioned in any record as having been a provincial or a royal seat of any line of kings.

MISCELLANEA

PURUSARTHA, DAIVA AND NIYATI

BY

P. C. DIVANJI

I. *Purusārtha and Mātsyanyāya*

The word 'Purusartha' is a compound word made up of two simple words 'Purusa' and 'Artha'. The former connotes a human being who is a conglomerate of an individualistic spirit a heart, a mind and a physical body containing, besides the above, a group of five organs of knowledge another of five of action and other subsidiary parts discharging the functions of connecting together the principal ones, supplying them with energy, etc. Thus by the very nature of his constitution man is apt to be engaged, either physically or mentally, in the pursuit of any of the four 'Arthas' (aims or objects), namely 'Dharma' (religious merit), 'Artha' (wealth in cash or kind) 'Kāma' (sensual enjoyment) and 'Moksa' (freedom from bondage). The two middle ones are universal and the first is common to a large majority of men, no matter what authority one looks to for guidance, but the last is the special subject of engagement of a limited number of them in all times and climes. So long as the pursuit of any of them does not result in or give cause for an apprehension of any injury to or interference with the freedom of other persons, no unpleasantness arises. This is however practically impossible because man is a social animal and prompted by self-interest and egotism he is consciously or unconsciously led to try to realise his ideals even on taking steps to brush aside others scornfully or even to exterminate them. The natural result therefore of unrestrained individual liberty is the prevalence of what is known in the Nītiśāstra as Mātsyanyāya, the lawless law, which prevails amongst the creatures of the fish variety and recognizes no other foundation of right except might.

2. In Book III of the *Yogavāsistha* there is an episode of a Rāksasī named Karkasī relating to this point.[1] Her hunger not being capable of being satiated by the ordinary food, she had taken to human flesh and was therefore always in search of stray human beings who could be pounced upon. Roaming about in a lonely forest she happened to find a king and his minister who had lost their way while out hunting and decided to pounce upon them, justifying that decision by a general statement that the lotus-born (Brahmā) having created the world had made it a rule that a stupid heartless creature shall serve as food for the carnivorous ones.[2] But in another episode, namely that of Prahlada, the author of the same work says that the prevalence of this law of the fish during the period, for which Prahlāda was unmindful of his royal duties towards his subjects living in Pātāla over which he ruled on the death of his father at the hands of the Nrsimha incarnation of Visnu, had led to a state of anarchy and that therefore Visnu was prevailed upon to rouse Prahlāda from his Samādhi and advise him to attend to his duties.[3] The *Mahābhārata* too narrates that such a catastrophe had befallen Northern India when King Vena, who was inimical to the principle of the division of the subjects into castes according to their professions, was killed by his subjects and that as he had left no son who could take his place, the leading Brāhmanas of the time hit upon the device of getting a son begotten on his widow by a Brāhmana by the Niyogavidhi. This son was the famous Prthu Vainya.[4]

3. These are instances of events which took place after the eastablishment of kingship in India. The *Yogavāsistha* also records a tradition[5] that in early pre-historic times the hearts of all men and women were so pure that they were never prompted to transgress the Dharma based upon respect for one another's sentiments and recognition of the rights of such individual property as was necessary for leading a simple pious life in that hoary age in order that they may, according to their own light, make the best use of their births as members of the

1 Y V. III 68-84. 2 Op Cit. III. 77. 2°.
3 Op Cit V. 37 7-17 4 Mbh VII. 65-71.
5 Y V. II. 10 11-44

that Aryan race and therefore there was no dominating political authority and no written texts of law. It also adds that when the divine sages who had been watching the course of events on the earth found that the moral standard of the people, had so deteriorated that they were dominated over by desire, anger, hatred, avarice, etc, and had, under the fits of such passions, begun to quarrel with one another, they started the institution of monarchy which kept the individuals' passions under control. It says that when further on they observed that even the kings of the different territories could not live amicably side by side but continued to fight with one another on and on, in order to extend their dominion and worldly possessions, the said sages propounded the works on Dharmaśāstra, which placed a restraint upon the vagaries of individual monarchs by casting upon them the duty to respect certain rules of municipal and international law based upon moral and spiritual principles, not only in times of peace but also in those of wars, which were thought to be unavoidable when both the parties to a dispute believed that he was in the right [1]

4 As regards the existence of separate Sāstras treating of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa, the *Mahābhārata* records one tradition that there was only one Pāñcarātra Sāstra treating of all the four objects of human pursuit composed by Citraśikhandi, i e. the seven great Ṛṣis, Marīci and others, that Svayambhū Manu was the first to compose a separate Śāstra based upon it, and that Bhṛgu and Bṛhaspati did so later on.[2] The *Manusmṛti* of the Bhārgavas records another that Brahmā had originally composed a Dharmaśāstra and taught it to Bhṛgu and that he recited it to the seven sages Marīci and others [3] The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana records a third that Prajāpati had originally composed a very big work on the Trivarga, i. e., the principles of Dharma, Artha and Kāma, that thereout, first of all, Manu separated the Dharmaśāstra, then Bṛhaspati the Arthaśāstra and lastly Nandi, a follower of Mahādeva, the Kāmaśāstra.[4] It appears from the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya [5] that there was a difference of opinion amongst the Vedic scholars as to

[1] Op Cit. II 11 4-18 [2] Mbh. XII 3 163 27-45
[3] M. S I. 58-60, 118-19 [4] K. S. I. 6 [5] K. A S. I 2. 1.

whether there were four independent Vidyās (sciences), namely Ānvīkṣikī, Trayī, Vārtā and Daṇḍa or the last three only, or the last two only, or the last only, that Kauṭilya was of the view that they were four and that that which Vātsyāyana has recorded is the view of the Mānavas, according to which there were three independent Vidyās, namely the Trayī, Vārtā and Daṇḍa, the Ānvīkṣikī, which according to Kauṭilya includes the Sāṁkhya, Yoga and Lokāyata, being only a Trayīviśesa, i. e. to say, a special development of the Trayī, the foundation of the Dharmaśāstra. This tradition besides being a comprehensive one, is older also than that recorded by Vātsyāyana because even according to Jolly, who places the Arthaśāstra in about 300 A. D. as against Fleet and Shamasastri who place it in 300 B. C.,[1] the said work is older than that of Vātsyāyana and substantially agrees with that contained in the exposition of the Nārāyaṇīya Dharma in the *Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata.*[2]

5. In the concluding verse in the passage containing a resumé of the contents of the work it is said that " it also contains a description of the Maryādās (restraints) of various sorts imposed on the earth and in Svarga " [3] This implies that the author of the work had thought it necessary to impose various kinds of restraint on the freedom of the individual souls to act as they liked These restraints must naturally have percolated in the Ekadeśī Śāstras which had been based thereon. It comes to this then that while the Śāstras relating to each of the four Puruṣārthas take it for granted on the one hand that each individual soul is free to act as he likes for the realisation of his ambition, they on the other hand impose certain restrictions on his activities for the benefit of society or a portion of it

6. Although in the present age, the old Śāstras have ceased to have binding force and an individual has comparatively more liberty to pursue his own ideals in the matters of religion and social relations, the authority of the state is there to check individual activities by enacting a *Law of the Land* in the interest of the society or the state even in those matters and in several

[1] Introduction by Jolly pp. 21, 24–29, 46–47, Shamashastri's edition–Introduction by Fleet.

[2] Mbh. XII. 3. 163. 26-45, [3] Op. Cit. verse 37.

other matters in which formerly states did not interfere. So after all, the position is that ever since the dawn of civilization on the earth, the freedom of the individual to act on the physical plane is to a certain extent placed under restraint or even counteracted by some superior powers on earth, whether he does or does not approve of it or even whether he does or does not understand the reason for which the restraint may have been imposed or the counteraction resorted to. This is realised more at a time when the state in which the individual resides is at war with another state or when the ideal of an individual comes into conflict with that of another with better means at his command. This kind of obstruction to the realisation of one's aim on the physical plane is however liable to be removed if one has a very strong will, a readiness to make the necessary sacrifice and the quantity and quality of strength required for the realisation of the specific aim in view.

II. *Puruṣārtha and Daiva*

7. Now, an ordinary man can come to know of the existence of such beings only as are his equals or inferiors spiritually That is so because his means of knowledge primarily are his five senses of knowledge by which he comes into contact with the outside world. But just as there are several classes of beings having bodies grosser than that of man, it is quite possible that there may be others having bodies subtler than his. With the help of his intellect, provided it is initially sharp or made so by the proper method, he can come to know of the existence and movements of some such, can study them and make them agreeable to his own aims But *a posteriori* knowledge is never complete and that is the reason why the scientific theories of yesterday are exploded to-day and those of to-day are liable to be exploded to-morrow with the possible acquisition of better means of knowledge. On the other hand, the faithful in every religion believe that there are certain orders of superior and inferior beings who have no physical bodies These purposes may as well be opposed to those of human beings as commensurate with them. In the former case, human efforts however sincere and persistent prove fruitless and the human beings concerned cannot account for the strange results There must however be some reason why such beings

should come in the way of the fulfilment of man's desire by his own sacrifice and exertion. The Indian sages of the later Vedic age, which preceded the births of Buddha and Mahāvīra, had thought over this subject carefully and come to the conclusion that the good and bad spiritual forces, whose operation is indicated by inexplicable events in one's life, are set into motion by one's own actions done in previous births. They either help or hamper man in his pursuits. This is the famous *Law of Karma*, which forms the foundation of the religious beliefs and practices of the Buddhists and Jainas as well as the Hindus. The text-books on Dharma, Artha and Kāma recommend the adoption of several appropriate remedies for counteracting obstacles coming from unseen forces in the realisation of one's ideals falling in any of the three categories and the works on the Mokṣaśāstra recommend the adoption of diverse means for securing complete freedom from the miseries, including that of the liability to frequent births and deaths, which the operation of the said law brings in its train.

8. The writers of the scientific treatises above-referred to seem to take it for granted that it is possible to remove the obstacles even though they may be arising from unseen forces. They do not, as a rule, enter into a discussion as to why it is possible to do so. The *Yogavāsiṣtha Mahārāmāyana*, which calls itself a *Mokṣopāya*, is not a work of that class. Unlike the scientific works it enters into a long discussion in Book II as to the scope for and efficacy of Puruṣārtha, the origin of Daiva and the way of its operation and inspires an optimistic spirit in the reader by proving that Daiva is capable of being supplanted, provided one has a very very strong will and persistently follows any of the numerous remedies which have been recommended therein for the realisation of one's ideal.[1] The argument advanced therein is in substance this that Daiva is nothing else but the result of your own past actions, that in the conflict between it and your Puruṣārtha, like a duel between two goats, that is bound to predominate which has a superior potentiality, that it is in your hands to establish the superiority of the latter, that a strong will and a

[1] Y. V. II. 4-9 ; VII a. 29, 5-11 ; 51. 47 ; 55, 31-34 ; 64. 9-36 ; 73. 7-8.

persistent effort only would enable you to do that, and that they will enable you to put up a strong fight if you keep up faith in the doctrine that the Purusa being the repository of all powers whatever is capable of achieving anything that he desires to achieve, including even the position of Prajāpati. The last point is illustrated therein by the episode of the ten sons of a Brāhmana named Indu given in Book III, which is to the effect that they having wished to become Prajāpatis and resorted to the necessary means towards that end did in fact become Prajāpatis in the next Kalpa, though not either in that very life or even after several fresh births in that Kalpa. [1]

III. *Purusārtha and Niyati*

9. The fact that the sons of Indu had to wait and persist in their effort and to submit to numerous privations till the end of the Kalpa before being the Prajāpatis at the commencement of the succeeding Kalpa introduces us to the existence of one more factor which we must take into consideration while determining the capabilities of an individual soul That factor is what is called *Niyati* in the Paurānic works That term is a noun derived from the root *yam* with *ni* meaning 'to restrain, curb, control or govern,' Its etymological meaning therefore is 'that which restrains, curbs, controls or governs something else' Its derivative meanings are the force which keeps under control or regulates the movements of all the creatures, animate as well as inanimate, i e to say, 'the Inner Regulator of all creatures' or 'the fixed order of things prevailing in the universe which keeps everything within the limits pertaining to its own inherent nature.' Essentially the human soul being of the same nature as the soul of the universe, i.e, to say, Brahman as it has become manifest, is completely free and therefore capable of attaining the fulfilment of all its desires. It was because of the truth of that principle that the sons of Indu having so wished could be the lords of creatures of diverse sorts But it was as the sons of an individual Brāhmana that they had conceived the idea of being so great and the realisation of that idea meant the displacement of the existing Prajāpatis, who were far more highly developed

[1] Y. V. III. 85-88

souls than the sons of Indu and the subversion of the order which had been fixed by Brahmā, the Creator, long before the sons of Indu conceived that idea as comparatively far more limited souls. The latter were not capable of doing any of those things. That was the reason why they had to wait and persist in their effort till the end of the Kalpa, when according to the original Samkalpa of Brahmā, the lives of the existing Prajāpatis were to come to an end. If the object of their desire had been such as could have been achieved without coming into conflict with such higher souls, less time and less effort would have been required, as was the case with the Brāhmana Vasistha and his wife who had conceived the desire to attain to the glory and dignity of a king and queen, they having been born as King Padma and his Queen Līlā,[1] or with Gādhi who only wished to have an experience of the nature of Visnu's Māyā, he having had it in that very life while he was bathing.[2]

10. Besides giving several such illustrations of the nature and power of this preponderating force the author of the *Yogavāsistha* has explained them in great details at several places in that work and explained its origin also.[3] The gist of what he says in the passages cited below is that Niyati is the order which prevails not only on this earth but also in the mid-air and in the different regions in the heavens, that it is binding on all creatures, gross and subtle, animate and inanimate, and that it was required to be established for otherwise there would have been chaos and injustice in all the three worlds That being so it could have no existence prior to the creation of the worlds and after their destruction. But so long as the universe subsists, there is no escape from it even for Brahmā, Visnu and Rudra, who are inferior gods charged with certain functions with reference to the universe, are Jīvas though of a higher order, and are in the same position as ministers in any government on earth A wise man, instead of trying to transgress

---

[1] Y. V. *III*. 15-67. [2] Op Cit. V. 44-49.

[3] Op. Cit II. 10, III, 53 24-40, 65. 8-20, 32, IV 10 24-73, 13-16, 36 30; 46. 28; 56. 12; V, 1. 19, 6. 1-18, 24 17-40, 39 24-29, 61. 42-48, 75. 27-35; VII a. 20. 16-41, 21. 23-25, 37, 77. 6 9, 88. 16, 104, 23-49; 105. 17, 43-44; VII b. 19-20.

it, tries to know its full nature and so long as his physical body lasts, acts in consonance with it without egotism, so that his acts may not create Vāsanā like those done for self-satisfaction and therefore with a sense of egotism He has no difficulty in knowing its nature because it is the inherent power of God made manifest in the diverse objects as the inherent nature of each of them severally, just as the same electric power generated at a central power-house makes itself manifest in diverse forms in different kinds of lamps, fans, stoves, mills, factories, workshops, etc., situated at varying distances and levels. Such being the case there is in fact no miracle in the world, for, a miracle is an event which cannot be explained logically as an effect from a known cause and there is none which cannot be so explained It may be that some events may appear miraculous to some people But there are others who are better informed than them and can therefore logically account for events which they cannot. They can do so because there are certain kinds of gems, certain mystic symbols or formulas and certain rare herbs which have the efficacy of causing events, which appear to those to whom the gems, symbols or formulas and herbs are unknown, to be contrary to the fixed order of things, otherwise called the *Law of Nature*, but to those who are aware of them to be quite in consonance with that order or law. It is not by the knowledge of the absolute truth that the knowledge of these things is acquired. There are separate sciences for its acquisition Therefore it is only when they are learnt, that one acquires the knowledge about them. And their mere knowledge even is not enough. Each science has its own method for the realisation of the truth which it inculcates. If it is properly followed one can even create such extraordinary events. The desire to do so is however a thorn in the path of self-realisation because there is no possibility of such a desire being ever satiated, and so long as it is not satiated, it acts as a hindrance in concentrating one's mind on the pure self. On this point there is an episode in the latter portion of the Nirvāna-prakaraṇa of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, namely that of King Vipaścit, [1] the materials for which seem to have been taken form the

[1] Op. Cit. VI b. 108-59.

Mārkandeya Purāna for the purpose of convincing the reader of the nature of Avidyā as explained by the sage Vasiṣṭha.

IV. *Conclusion*

11 It follows from the above that a human being's ambitions and activities must, in order to be successful, be confined within the limits imposed by the world-order. If even a Jīva who has risen to be a Brahmā, Visnu or Rudra cannot change it, much less can a poor Jīva on whose powers there are so many limitations besides those on any of the three gods. These limitations operate only as regards the acquisition of this or that power on the physical or metaphysical plane because the ambition to be the proud possessor of the power of a god or a godling does not differ from that to be a proud emperor or a president of a republic or a prime minister of an empire or of a part of it or, for the matter of that, from that to be a high priest or a millionaire or even to be the husband of a beautiful and cultured wife. In the matter of self-knowledge and self-realisation they do not because the path for them lies in quite the opposite direction and all the kit that one is likely to stand in need of, while proceeding along it, is of such a nature that one can acquire it without coming into conflict with any other Jīva, high or low, and Niyati, the Divine or the Supreme Power will always be there to help one cross the hurdles that lie along the path, provided one has a strong will and a capacity to make the requisite sacrifices, and makes a persistent effort for the realisation of that highest ideal.

SOME FORGOTTEN SANSKRIT POETS OF KARNĀṬAKA

BY

DASHARATHA SHARMA

The object of this short note is to correct a few mistakes that are to be found in Mr *Srikantha Sastri's* paper published under the above caption in the *Silver Jubilee Volume* of the *Annals* [1]

The first forgotten Karnātaka poet mentioned by Mr. Sastri is one Amarānanda Actually he is none else than the celebrated Amaruka The verse "*ekatrāsanasaṃsthiti*" is to be found on page 20 of the *Amarukaśataka* of the Nirnayasāgara Press and has been commented on by the Paramāra ruler Arjunavarmamadeva (c. 1211-1225 A. D.)

According to Mr. Sastri, the Digambara scholar Kumudacandra was defeated by Hemacandra. But if he consults either the *Mudritakumudacandra* of Yaśaścandra, a contemporary work, or the *Prabhāvakacarita*, he will find that the credit of having beaten him belongs actually to Vādi-Devasūri

In some other cases, Mr. Sastri appears to assign to Karnāṭaka a number of poets who did not actually belong to it. But as he is himself far from sure on these points, it would perhaps be unnecessary to criticise his findings.

PIPPALIKĀ

BY

DASHARATHA SHARMA

In his paper on the *Bhūpālavallabha* published in the Silver Jubilee Volume of the Annals, [2] Mr. S L. Katre identifies Pippalikā of the Ms described by him with Piplīā, a small *Jāgīr* held by Khīcī Cauhāns in the Ujjain district of the Gwalior State Actually, however, it is Pīplyā, a second class *Jāgīr* in Mewar governed now, as in Samvat 1781, the year of the copying of the Ms, by Śaktāwat Rājputs who, as noted by Mr. Katre also, trace their descent from Śaktasingh, a brother of Mahārāṇā Pratāpsingh. Bāghjī Saktāwat was one of the Sardars of Mahārāṇā Sangrāmasingh (V. 1773-1791), who appointed him as his *Vakil* at the court of Chatrapati Shāhūjī. As this Maratha monarch regarded himself as a descendant of the Mewar royal family, he, according to the *Vaṃśabhāskara*, addressed Bāghjī as *kākā* (uncle).[3]

[1] Annals, B. O R. I. Vol. XXIII, pp. 415-423. [2] *ibid* pp. 224-241.

[3] *Vaṃśabhāskara*, pp. 3222-23, G. H. Ojha-History of Udaipur, II, p. 619.

KAVĪNDRAKALPALATĀ, A HINDĪ WORK BY KAVĪNDRĀCĀRYA SARASVATĪ

BY

DASHARAHTA SHARMA

Some time back I received a complimentary copy of Śrīyut P. K. Gode's learned paper on Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī. With my interest in this eminent and practical ascetic aroused by this, I requested Sāhityaratna Pandit Rāmaniwās Hārita of Srī Anūpa Saṁskṛta Library, Bikaner, to look through the books under his charge, and was fortunate enough to learn from him of two Hindi works connected with this scholar, viz., the *Kavīndra-candrikā*, a collection of addresses in Hindī similar to those in Sanskrit, already published in the *Kavīndracandrodaya*, and the *Kavīndra-kalpalatā*, a eulogistic work composed by *Kavīndrācārya* himself.

As the former of these compositions gives us the names of all the chief Benares Hindi poets of Shahjahan's time, I have contributed a note about it to the *Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Patrikā*, the premier Hindī quarterly of Benares The other work, which forms the subject of this short Paper, begins with three Sanskrit verses of salutation to Vāṇī, Bhavānī, Śiva, and Gaṇeśa; the statement that Kavīndra is the author of the *Kalpalatikā*, and the wish that it might be read by people to the end of our *Kalpa*. Then follow the following autobiographical details about the poet :—

" He, first, lived on the bank of the river Godāvarī, from whence he migrated to Benares. He became a Saṁnyāsī before he was hardly out of his boyhood. He was a follower of the *Āśvalāyana śākhā* of the *Ṛgveda* and had composed innumerable books including commentaries on the *Vedas* He had ended the troubles of Prayāga and Kāśī and composed these verses in vernacular, though it was somewhat below his dignity to do so. "

The remaining portion of the work falls into the following parts :—

(1) *Kavittas* in honour of Shāhjahān.
(2) *Dhrupadas* „ „ „ „
(3) *Viṣṇupadas* – 10 in number.
(4) Verses devoted to *Tattvajñāna* (the problem of truth).
(5) *Kavittas* in honour of Dārāshāh.
(6) „ „ „ „ Begam Sāhab.

(7) Miscellaneous (*nānāvasayaka*) verses.
(8) A few more verses in honour of Dārāshāh.
(9) *Kavittas* in honour of Prince Murād.

The amount of historical information in the book is not, unfortunately, however, very great. From the first two sections, we at the most learn that Shāhjahān conquered parts of the Deccan, reduced the Bijapuris to submission, forced the ruler of Golkundā to obey his authority, carried devastation to Bokhārā and Khorāsān, captured Kandhār, and founded the magnificent city of Shāhjahānābād. The 23rd *Dhrupada* describes the Emperor's throne, most probably the celebrated *Takht-i-Tāus*. The philosophic verses describe the chief Indian schools of thought, specially the Vedānta. They were probably meant for the instruction of Prince Dārā Shikoh (Dārāshāh of our Ms.) who is known to have been interested in the Upanisadic way of thinking. Kavīndrācārya calls him *Wali Ahad* (heir-apparent) and credits him with the knowledge of all the categories of the *Tarkaśāstra* (Logic and Atomism).[1]

The Begam Sāhab of section 6 looks Jahānārā, for the poet prays that she might live for ever with the affection of her father (obviously Shāhjahan) and her brother (Dārā Shikoh) Murād is evidently the fourth son of Shāhjahan. His being selected for praise in preference to Shujā and Aurangzeb, respectively the second and third sons of the Emperor, perhaps indicates that he was either very generous or less disliked at the court than his two other brothers left unnoticed and unsung by Kavīndrācārya.

In the miscellaneous portion, we find the name of one Sayyad Hayat Khān, probably one of Shāhjahān's commanders and a friend of Dārā Students of Mughal History should try to trace his name either in the Badshāhnāmā or some other source for Shāhjahān's life.

As regards the composition of the book, it might, reasonably, be put somewhere between 1638 and 1657 A. D. One of the limits is fixed by the events described therein and the other by the beginning of the War of Succession and the consequent enmity between Dārā and Murād

[1] "कौन कहावन मम दारथ, कौन नवद्रव्य, कौन चौबीस गुन कौन पांच कर्म कौन सामान्य विशेष, कौन समवाय कौन कौन चतुर अभाव कौन आतमधर्म कौन त्रिविध काल कौन एकादश दिशा कौन समरूप कौन काहिये रस त्रिविध धर्म इनके सब भेद आनत"

(Kavitta 12)

THE SHEET ANCHOR OF INDIAN HISTORY, A CRITICISM

BY

Dasharatha Sharma

In a paper contributed to the Silver Jubilee Volume of the *Annals*, Dr. D S. Triveda has tried to disprove the indentity of Sandrocottus of the Greek writers and Candragupta Maurya, saying that this *so-called* sheet anchor of Indian History is " the greatest mistake ever committed in the field of Indian chronology, literature and history ".[1] These are rather hard words to use So let us see what his arguments are for going against the considered judgment of other scholars, even though we might not be disposed to think much of the thesis of a writer who remarks that the Asokan inscriptions should, in spite of their different script, language and subject-matter, be ascribed to Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty.

We generally identify Xandrames or Agrammes, the ruler of Magadha at the time of Alexander's invasion, with Nanda Augrasenya, because the story of his father's rise and low birth given by Curtius agrees with that of the first Nanda in the *Mahābodhivaṁśa*, the Jaina *Pariśisthaparvan* and the *Purānas*. Dr. Triveda however desires that we should regard him as Samudragupta He believes that it is the story of Samudragupta's father Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty that is told in the following words of the Greek writer referred to above :—

" His (Agrammes') father was in tact a barber, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who, from his not being uncomely in person, had gained the affections of the queen, and was by her influence advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning sovereign. Afterwards, however, he treacherously murdered the sovereign and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian to the royal childern, usurped the

[1] p. 584.

supreme authority, and having put the young princes to death begot the present king ".[1]

To get at the equation, Xandrames = Samudragupta, he has, however, to make the following suppositions :—

1 Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty murdered Candraśrī, strangely enough identified here with Xandrames even though the latter has been already equated with Samudragupta. This Candraśrī is said to have been the penultimate ruler of the Āndhra dynasty

2 Candragupta I begot of Candraśrī's widowed queen a son named Pulomā

3 Candragupta I murdered this child of his own a few years later and put himself on the throne.

4 Candraśrī = Sundaravarman of the *Kaumudimahotsava.*

5 Pulomā = Kalyāṇavarman of the same drama.

One has just to look at this formidable list of suppositions to have some idea of the way Dr Triveda has manufactured history to support his pet theory. Actually, he has not a shred of reliable evidence to go by. So he just imagines certain things to have happened and regards them as equally sound arguments in his favour Not a single *Purāṇa* says or even hints that Pulomā was an illegitimate child and his father was murdered by Candragupta I. So he just throws the *Puranas* over-board and presses the poor *Kaumudimahotasava* into service. But where does this drama aver that Kalyāṇavarman's father was an Āndhra or was named Candraśrī ? He is actually named Sundaravarman and was the ruler of Pātalīputra. And then what makes him equate Kalyāṇavarman with Pulomā ? Does the drama say anywhere that he was, like Dr. Triveda's supposedly illegitimate Pulomā, begotten on Sundaravarman's wife by Candasena ?

We do not think that Dr. Triveda has any good replies to these queries, and will, therefore, assume, for the time being at least, that the old equation Agrammes = (Nanda) Augrasenya stands. According to Greek accounts, the man who displaced Agrammes on the throne of Pātaliputra was Sandrocottus. Indian

1 McCrindle, *The invasion of India by Alexander*, p. 222.

accounts give this credit of deposing Nanda (already equated with Agrammes) to Candragupta Maurya. So Candragupta Maurya and Sandrocottus must naturally be regarded as the names of one and the same person.

Equally fallacious are his following arguments against the equation, Candragupta Maurya = Sandrocottus :—

1 Candragupta Maurya cannot be the man meant by Justin's remark that "Sandrocottus was born of humble life," because Mauryas are known to have been a famous Kṣatriya clan.

2 The Greek accounts of 327 B C do not contain any reference to Buddhism This shows that they were written after the Buddhist Mauryan dynasty had ended and the Bhāgavata Gupta rulers had begun ruling India.

The first of the above arguments does not mean much, because Candragupta might have actually occupied a very humble station in life before his elevation to the throne of Pātaliputra, even though he was the member of a well-known caste and family. High and noble parentage and wealth and influence do not always go together. As regards the absence of references to Buddhism, does not Megasthenes speak of the *Śramaṇas* and their deity, the *Boutta*? Dr Triveda's attempt to explain these away by regarding *Śramaṇas* as *Vānaprasthas* and Boutta as *Bhautikas* is, to say the least, extremely unconvincing, for, we, at least, do not know of any phonetic law by which the equation between Boutta and Buddha might be disallowed and that suggested by Dr. Triveda permitted? Does he really regard *Bhautika* as phonetically nearer to Boutta than the word Buddha suggested by other historians? Or is it like many other of his arguments, just a supposition to bolster up an otherwise indefensible position? Further what is there to show that Buddhism had disappeared from the land of its birth as early as 327 B. C.? Does not such a supposition show the learned Doctor's ignorance, or at least supreme neglect, of the accounts of the Chinese travellers Fahien and Hieun Tsang and the numerous Buddhist donations going up to the 12th century of the Christian era?

Other arguments used by Dr. Triveda to prove that Sandrocottus was not a Maurya are :—

1 Absence of any allusion to a foreign invasion at the time of the fall of the Nanda dynasty and reference on the other hand to a Mleccha incursion at the close of the Āndhra rule.

2 Absence of references to the *satī* system in the Arthaśāstra even though it is referred to by Megasthenes.

3 Reference by a Greek writer to the Āndhras as a very strong power

4 Megasthenes statement that the king, in addition to his family, must have the surname *Palibothra*, a word which the learned Doctor appears to equate either with Gupta or Āditya.

But are not these arguments too as fallacious as those already noted above? The Nanda dynasty was not ended by any Greek invasion. So why should he expect to find a reference to it in the *Purāṇas*? And as regards the Mlecchas in India at the time of the ending of the Āndhra dynasty, does he not have enough of them in the Śakas, Kushanas and Parthians etc. Further the verse that he quotes in favour of his view, without naming its source, does not say that the Mlecchas ended the Āndhra kingdom? All that it actually states is that many descendants of the Mlecchas would be invading India in the time of the Āndhras, and this we know to be a fact well attested to by history. The Śakas reached India in this period and so did some other foreign races also. So why should Dr. Triveda suppose that the forces referred to are those of Alexander? Perhaps he has to do so because of his supposition that the Āndhra dynasty ended in 327 B. C, even though such a hypothesis would be against the well attested contemporariety of a Sātakarni ruler with Rudradāman of the Girnar inscription (Saka year 72 = 150 A. D.) and our knowledge from Chinese and other sources that the Sakas reached India much later than 327 B. C.[1]

Nor does the absence of any reference to the *sati* system prove that the Greeks did not reach India in the Mauryan Period, because not only is silence not a good basis for basing sound

[1] In or about 165 B. C the Yuechi were defeated and expelled from their country by Hiung-nū The Yuechi in their turn attacked the Sakas in the plains of the Syr Darya and compelled them to move southwards and enter Indian territories. The date of this event would naturally be not earlier than 150 B. C.

theories but also because we find it referred to in the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyana* and the *Purānas* too, the composition of all of which should according to a Pandita like Dr. Triveda, be referred to a pre-Greek period. One has just to read the discussions between Mādrī and Kuntī, and these widowed queens and the *rsis* to see that *anumarana* was a well-established Aryan custom of the Period and is actually pre-Mauryan even though we might not find any reference to it in the Arthaśāstra [1]

Dr Triveda regards the mention of Āndhras too as a strong power by the Greeks as a point in his favour. Actually, however, it is something against him. From his point of view there should not be any Āndhra power at all after 327 B. C, the year in which their rule is, according to Dr. Triveda, believed to have ended. Nevertheless if he finds a strong Āndhra power after 327 B C, should it not suggest to him that his hypothesis is radically wrong somewhere and needs a thorough over-hauling?

Equally fallacious is his argument from the statement of Megasthenes that the king in addition to his family name should have the surname *Palibothra*. This word is known to be the equivalent of Pātaliputra from the account of Megasthenes himself. So all that it possibly means, (though I should not be dogmatic on the point), is that the Mauryan rulers were, known also as *Pātaliputriyas* after their capital city. It is perhaps better to explain it in this manner than to equate it with Gupta or Āditya, the two words proposed by Dr. Triveda.

To sum up, we might say that Dr. Triveda has, throughout his paper, tried to disprove the equation Sandrocottus = Candragupta Maurya by putting forward arguments to prove that the Greeks could not have reached India in the Mauryan Period. If his reasoning be regarded as valid, we should naturally be

---

[1] Kunti-

Aham jyeṣṭhā dharmapatnī jyeṣṭham dharmaphalam mama
avaśyambhāvino bhāvān mā mā Mādri nivartaya ॥ 63 ॥

Vaiśampāyana-

Ṛṣayastān samāśvāsya ... .
ūcuh Kuntīm ca Mādrīm ca ....
bhartrānumaranam sārtham phalavannātra samśayah
yuvābhyām duṣkaram caitad vadanti dvijapuṅgavāh ॥ 83 ॥

Ādiparva, Chapter CXV (P. P. S. Sāstri's edition).

obliged to equate Sandrocottus of their accounts not with Candragupta Maurya but some other Candragupta, even with Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty, if it might be proved at the same time that the Gupta dynasty began ruling in 327 B. C. Dr. Triveda finds the well-established equation, Agrammes = Augrasenya (Nanda) One of the greatest stumbling blocks in the way of his new hypothesis. So he attacks that too with all the force he can, equating Xandrames or Agrammes with Samudragupta, the second ruler of the Gupta dynasty. We, however, regard Dr. Triveda's attempt at dislodging this old sheet anchor of Indian History, the equation Sandrocottus = Candragupta Maurya, a failure because, as shown above:-

1 He cannot disprove the equation Agrammes = Augrasenya Nanda without getting involved into a number of palpably absurd suppositions.

2 None of his arguments can put Alexander's invasion after the Mauryan Period.

3 His view that the Andhra dynasty ended in 327 B. C. goes against the well-known fact of their rivalry with the Śakas who are known to have entered India not earlier than 150 B C. or so.

Here we might further add that coins, inscriptions, as well as literary sources [1] prove that the Gupta dynasty was founded on the ruins of the Saka and Kushana empires, both of which naturally flourished after 150 B. C, the earliest year proposed for the entry of the Sakas into India [2] Dr. Triveda's attempt to make Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty a contemporary of Alexander appears rather surprising after so many years of patient Indian research, though it is certainly no impossible feat for one who can ascribe the Asokan inscriptions to Candra gupta II. Dr. Triveda accuses other historians of "working under preconception and trying to modify or alter the readings to suit their identification." But might not the same charge be levelled against him with equal or even greater justification ?

[1] Of literary sources, Dr Triveda might be referred to the Purāṇas.

[2] See note 3

REVIEWS

MARATHA HISTORY (Re-examined) 1295-1707—by Prof. S. R. Sharma, M A., Fergusson College, Poona.

Prof. S. R. Sharma, the author of the popular volumes on Mughal History, has now brought out the first volume of his Maratha History. As the title indicates the principal aim of the author is a re-examination of the history of the Maratha nation. In spite of the histories of Sprengel and Scott Waring written before him and that of Kincaid and Parasnis after him, the history of the Marathas by the celebrated Grant Duff has not been replaced as yet

The first intelligent criticism of Grant Duff's history came from a young Deccan Collegian, the late Mr. N. J. Kirtane. Since, then a steadily growing movement is at work to ransack old documents and to study, edit and publish them. The great Rajwade has made his name immortal in this field. His conceptions of history and historiography were very large and comprehensive. History to him was not merely the story of the political achievements of the people but must deal with both aspects–the material and moral aspects, including, the economic, the literary, and cultural, the military, and the religious. Since this lead from Rajwade, a number of scholars and associations have engaged themselves successfully in unearthing a large mass of original material bearing on the life and achievements of the Maratha country and its peoples. This work of research is still going on apace but those engaged in it have hardly shown any inclination to produce any histories. Fortunately, however, Rao Bahadur Govind Sakharam Sardesai undertook some fifty years ago, to devote his whole life to the writing of a new history of the Marathas in the Marathi language and his Riyasat bears testimony to his great industry and devotion. An English version of the Riyasat is, it is learnt, under preparation.

The chief aim of Rao Bahadur Sardesai is to supply a reliable narrative of the political history of the Marathas. He has, therefore, naturally entered into details of all important events occurr-

ing in Maratha history. He has not applied himself more intently to the task of interpreting Maratha history, so far. Besides, this Riyasat has been written in the Marathi language. Hence, for those who do not understand the Marathi language there is no book which is based on a careful study of all the extant sources and materials Prof S R. Sharma aspires to do this much-needed service to students of history "I have" he says "looked at the pattern as a whole without inspecting the parts too closely" and in doing so "I have tried to be artistic without being unscientific, sympathetic without being uncritical and simple without being unhistorical".

This is just the first volume of Prof. Sharma's reexamination of Maratha history. The whole picture is not yet complete and we should not therefore be justified in expressing our opinion fully and finally till we have the finished product before us. As it is in the first part the author has reviewed the course of the history of the Marathas since the fall of Devagiri till the reassertion of Maratha power at the death of Emperor Aurangzeb, a period covering well-nigh four centuries.

This is indeed by far the most glorious and glowing period of the history of the Marhattas The ancient Maratha dynasty of the Yadavas of Devgiri was superseded first by the Khiljis, followed by the Tughlaks and its place was occupied by the Bahmani dynasty, which after a career of about a century and half, was split up into the Panchsahis or five independent states. It was during the latter period that the Marathas, vanquished at Devgiri, once more re-established their supremacy. This last phenomenon was the Maratha Empire, which fell a prey to the power of the British.

The author has divided his book into ten chapters. The titles thereof will at once show that the author has painted a full picture of the birth, growth and achievement of the Maratha nation. He has attempted to fit the parts into the whole and in their proper places. He wields a powerful pen and shows himself to be a consummate artist who combines skill with proportion.

In the first chapter he depicts the Back-ground of his story. The Marathas of Shivaji and Bajirao are better known than their ancient progenitors, the Marathas of the Yadava period. The

Yādava Empire of the pre-Muslim days was no doubt a Maratha Empire. Hence all historians of Maharashtra have necessarily referred to it. Grant Duff and Kincaid speak of the Devgiri Yadavas But it was reserved for the genius of Ranade to understand its significance better than others. Prof. Sharma has therefore rightly devoted his opening chapter to the destruction of the Yadava Kingdom by the Khiljis of Delhi. In fact the chapter entitled 'the Back-ground' is an illuminating attempt to explain the downfall of the Yadava power. Unfortunately Prof Sharma had to rely mainly on Muhammadan sources, as very few non-muslim sources have yet been discovered. The reasons commonly attributed to the sudden collapse of Raja Ramdeo Rao of Devgiri are absolutely unconvincing! How could a wealthy kingdom be crippled in a single battle! One battle of Devgiri or one battle of Rakshastagadi could never afford a rational explanation of the destruction of vast and wealthy kingdoms. It often constitutes the best visible symbol of a long series of causes working in the past. The true explanation, therefore, must be sought for somewhat deeper by peeping into the social, economic and cultural aspects, which condition the whole life of a people and go to shape its character Perhaps, a minute and patient analysis of the literary evidence available of the Yadava period may go to help us towards supplying a solution. This much-needed research has not yet been carried out. In fact, our historians have not directed their attention towards it seriously as yet. The Hindus collapsed miserably before the onslaught of the Muhammadans, both in the north and south. Could we not find a satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon in the general organisation and make up of the Hindu society? After thus assessing this factor or general cause we may take into consideration any particular causes. Granted that Raja Ramdeo was incapable and inefficient, why should Raghu, Harpaldev, Shankardeo and the two 'tigresses' have failed at the cost of their lives? In spite of sects and in spite of castes, the Hindu society, has outlived these thousands of years It has often had to bend but it has never broken completely We must study its history both as that of a whole as well as also of its constituent limbs or parts. The

Yadava period must be restudied in detail in this way. However, Prof Sharma deserves credit for putting in one compass the salient points concerning the fall of the Yadavas and supplying such explanation and interpretation as could be worked out with the limited sources available. Prof. Sharma touches the subject again in the last chapter also.

After depicting 'The Back-ground' Prof. Sharma details the succeeding period as that of Tutelage. During this period the Marathas had to go through a long period of discipline both in the arts of peace and war. The civil department of Government remained in their hands and their help became necessary in the military campagins of the Muhammadans. The common traditions of Hasan Gangu being originally the slave of a Brahmin, called Gangu, perhaps our Gangaraspant as a fragmentary bakhar alluded to by Rajawade in the Proceedings of the B I. S Mandal says, is not referred to by Prof. Sharma. The occasional references in old traditional accounts of many a Maratha Kshatriya family to Kālā (black) Khoja and Gorā (white) Khoja may well be interpreted in terms of the conflict between the Deshi and Pardeshi parties at the Muhammadan courts of the Deccan.

During the period of tutelage, not only the pen and the sword but the soul of the Maratha people was revived through the rise of the saints. What is known as the Pandharpur movement no doubt went a great way in recreating faith and recapturing the lost soul of the people A new and healthy turn was given to this noblest of democracies, the democrary of the Bhaktas (W B Patwardhan) by the dynamic personality of Ramdas who preached his philosophy of action and spread a net work of his disciples, twelve hundred in number, throughout the land The 'Maharashtra Dharma' was not merely a religious phase. It had a deeper social and political meaning and its chief exponent was Saint Ramdās This Maharashtra Dharma was not the direct outcome of the Pandharpur movement. These cultural and social forces, strengthened by the assertive efforts of the Dafles, the Nimbalkars, the Shirkes, the Bhosales, the Manes and numerous others, especially in the mountain fastnesses of the Maval territories, eventually led to the rise of a mighty national power—the Maratha Swarajya All this makes one of the most fascinating and inspring stories in the history of India, perhaps

of the world and Prof. Sharma has drawn a vivid picture of the same with necessary warmth and vigour.

The part played by Shahaji, the celebrated father of Shivaji, has been clearly brought out by the writer as the work of a great Pioneer of Maratha Swarajya However, Prof. Sharma would have done well to have emphasised that the Danpatra of Sambhaji alludes to Shahaji as the defender of Haindava (Hindu) Dharma and that he had appointed separate officers like the Peshwa, Mujumdar for the twelve year old son, Shivaji, whom he sent away to his Poona jagir, out of which some thirty six villages were given as Mokasa to the latter. The significant seal of Shivaji found to have been used at least as early as 1645 A. D. reveals in unmistakable terms the noble aims and the firm faith and hope of the militant Maratha Swarajya party of the period. It is a matter for satisfaction for us that Prof Sharma has boldly come forward to reaffirm the thesis of that great seer Ranade in this book and enlarge and expand it with such corrections, additions and modifications as became necessary on account of the very large amount of new sources that have accumulated during the period of nearly half a century since then.

Prof. Sharma in his later chapters treats of the rise of Sivaji and the foundation of Swarajya, the unique declaration of an independent sovereign Hindu Chhatrapati, the crisis that overtook the newly founded Swarajya after the death of Shivaji, the wonderful and stout defence that the newly created Maratha nation offered to the haughty and indomitable Alamgir, who was exhausted and at last expired in the attempt, and the final reassertion of the Maratha Power in Maharashtra ! In the course of his argument Prof. Sharma had naturally to challenge the conclusions and in some places even the facts, of older veterans but he has not faltered in this work and given a good account of his mettle.

The last chapter of Prof. Sharma's review of Maratha History sums up ' the Achievement ' of the Marathas. He characterises the Maratha resorgiment as a unique phenomenon in Indian History. " They had created a New State and a New order superior to any that had hitherto existed in Hindu India ". This view may be accepted as correct so far as we limit ourselves to

Hindu India since the rise of the Muslims in this continent. "The triumph of the Marathas" during this period "was the triumph of a people, a nation rather than that of a few men of genius" "Neither the Rajputs nor the Sikhs" nor even the Vijayanagar Empire, "could ever rise to the great eminence reached by the Marathas," "and the hidden sources" of the Maratha Power "lay in the character of the people and their country". This is indeed a warm, yet just tribute that the author pays to this masterful people

"A man of superb genius" Shivaji, the deliverer of the enslaved Marathas, must, in fact, be considered "a creature of Maharashtra". "Sivaji" the author further says "for us is neither saint nor sinner but just human, impelled by human motives, to achieve human ends in a human world" (p. 126). It is difficult to reconcile this view of the author with an earlier statement of his on pp 113 & 114 where he speaks of 'Destiny' and 'Divinity' and avers. "If Hindu civilisation was to survive, a new avatār was needed. He appeared in the person of Sivaji". We believe the former view to be more sound, which attributes more to the people and their character than to individuals, however great, or may be-avatārs.

We agree with the dictum of the author when he says, "when the authenticity of each fact is ascertained and established beyond doubt or the evidence is verified the verdict may not be shirked" (p. 125). We are, therefore, entitled to ask him whether the treaty between Sivaji and his younger brother Vyankoji quoted by the author pp. 197-199 is a genuine fact or merely an inference. The Shiv Digvijaya Bakhar may contain some very valuable truths yet we can not ascribe to the letters and documents mentioned therein the same status of validity and treat them on a par with original documents, whose reliability could be severely tested and established beyond the shadow of doubt. None of the letters quoted in the Shiv Digvijaya appear to be genuine. The so called treaty referred to by our author is obviously a product of the fertile imagination of the chronicler who is seen to be fond of the display of his knowledge! To quote such an imaginary docu-

ment, not only this, but to ascribe to it the status of 'the Political Testament' of Sivaji is going too far indeed!

On page 181 our author similarly refers to another document which "if authentic" should in his opinion "be considered as the Magna Carta of Maratha Swarajya" On page 273 he refers to it again as 'the great charter of civil rights." He quotes the document on page 321. The document has been published by Mr. K. S. Thackerey. But he gives no reference to its origin. On a careful examination and close comparison with genuine documents of Shivaji in original it would not take us long to convince ourselves that the document in question is not genuine The language used is unlike the language used in the other genuine documents of Shivaji Compare for instance such words occurring in the document as हिंदुमहाराष्ट्रान् – ग्रहस्थान् – ज्ञातीवाले or परंतु लिहिण्याचे कारण की &c. The Govt. is here referred to as सरकार which is not found in any official letters of Sivaji. Then the ending मर्यादेयं is not enclosed in the usual form. Shivaji is referred to as श्री राजा सिवाजी छत्रपती the correct way being श्री राजा सिव छत्रपती The seal at the top as printed in the document under examination here gives four lines instead of the five found in the genuine seals of Sivaji. Besides, the date as given in the document, corresponds to 28th Jan. 1677. Now Sarkar states that Sivaji started on his long term Carnatak campaign at the *beginning* of Jan 1677, (Sarkar's Sivaji p 289). But we are inclined to belive that Sivaji started on this campaign *earlier* when Mr Muloverer arrived from Raigry' as reported in a letter dated 2nd Oct. 1676 and supported by Vatanpatra p. 47. Sivaji had planned a long absence and hence if at all he had wished to issue a proclamation of civil rights he should have done so not at the *end* of Jan. 1677, when he was already on the march but much earlier. Enough has thus been said, we believe, to prove how the document can not be genuine Further, the document merely confirms the different communities in the proper enjoyment of their religious practices and customs in spite of where they might have been suppressed. It is too much to describe it as Magna Carta or a proclamation of civil rights.

We are fully conscious of the fact that such issues and discussions as we have raised above can not be allowed to detain

us longer here. And yet we feel it quite necessary to invite the attention of scholars both in Maharashtra and outside to study very closely and at first hand the voluminous mass of documents, literary, political, economic, judicial and others, before they build up their conclusions and present the history of the Marathas. We will not otherwise ever succeed in doing proper justice to the subject. This is no light task we know. The scattered materials have not yet been systematically and scientifically analysed and studied in a thorough manner. That this work is beyond the scope of an individual, however gifted, needs no proving. We, however, regret to notice that scholars who are unable to read the Marathi documents in the Modi script have had the temerity to declare to a world, unfortunately ignorant of the language and script, that they have thoroughly studied the Marathi materials and have passed categorical opinions going to the length of poohpoohing the 'discoveries' and 'unearthing' of documents constantly going ahead in Maharashtra and declaring that those discoveries contain 'forgeries'. We would here warn Indian scholars against such thorough and ignorant condemnation of documents by men who are themselves unable to read even the Modi Script and are consequently not competent to pass such excathedra judgments We feel confident that in the end the value and authenticity of the large mass of Marathi materials would be thoroughly proved and accepted. In the end, we welcome scholars like Prof. Sharma and their efforts to elucidate the history of the Marathas

D. V. Potdar

ICONOGRAPHY OF ŚRI VIDYĀRṆAVATANTRA By Prof. S. Srīkaṇṭha Śāstri, M.A., (copies can be had of R. Harirao, Curator Mythic Society, Cenotaph Road, Bangalore City), pp. 46. Price Re. 1 or 2 Shillings

In spite of the few Volumes on Indian Iconography containing both textual and critical matter, the need for further studies especially of the critical variety incorporating the Iconographical data collected from numerous sources still remains. In this connection the Iconographic data contained in the numerous Tāntric works both published and unpublished is extremely valuable. The tāntric worship necessarily presupposes description of images of Gods and Goddesses and consequently our Tāntric texts which describe these Gods and Goddesses with minute details are a rich mine of information bearing on the history and development of Indian Iconography. We are therefore glad to find Prof. Śrīkantha Śāstri analysing the *Vidyārṇavatantra* published by the Govt. of Kashmir (1932-1937) and presenting its iconographic data in a clear-cut form for the benefit of the students of Indian Iconography. His method is worth being followed by other scholars with regard to numerous other Tāntric texts so that in course of time it may be possible for subsequent scholars to compile a Dictionary of Indian Iconography in which the Iconography of every image known to Indian Literature, whether Jain, Buddhist or Brahmanical, is portrayed in brief In this manner alone the Science of Indian Iconography can be given a proper historical perspective worth the name. The contribution of Indian Iconography to Indian art in general can only be exactly ascertained on the strength of scientifically collected material recorded in the form of a Dictionary. In his present brochure Prof. Śāstri has given us the Iconographic material under the groups of images named severally as the *Śākta*, *Śaiva*, *Vaiṣṇava*, *Saura*, *Kaumāra*, *Gāṇapatya etc.* The essential characteristics of these groups have also been pointed out by him This grouping will be found useful not only by the students of Indian Iconography but also by the students of Hindu religion who care to know its iconographic aspect.

According to Prof. Śāstri, the present work was composed between A. D. 1520 and 1720, a period when the tantras appear

to have been radiating their iconographic lustre as will be seen from the present analysis of the *Vidyārnava Tantra* If we analyse some of the celebrated Tantras composed during a definite period of history, we shall get a very clear idea of the development of Indian Iconography of that period. We trust therefore that Prof. Śāstri himself will analyse at least a few major tantras pertaining to the different periods of history so as to make his study representative of the entire field of Indian Iconography.

The regional aspect of Indian Iconography which still remains shrouded in mystery also deserves our special attention in view of the present interest of the Indian public in the history of different regions of India in all its aspects.

We, therefore, congratulate Prof. Śāstri on his present critical study which is as pains-taking and scholarly as his previous studies in other fields of Indology.

P. K. Gode

SAṄGĪTA RATNĀKARA Translation by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, (Adyar Library Series).

In the past, ths Ānandāsram-edition of the Sangīta Ratnākara was the only well-known edition which contained the full text and also the commentary of Kallinath The present edition contains the commentary of Simhabhūpāla in addition to the text and the commentary of Kallinath. Further, the Adyar series has done a good service to the public in simultaneously issuing an English translation of both the text and the two commentaries, along with critical notes explaining the subtle terms and ideas involved, from the pen of no less a person than Dr. C. Kunhan Raja.

Only a working knowledge of Sanskrit is not enough to understand the exact meaning of the text and to interpret it in the terms of modern musical practices. One and the same Sanskrit term is used often in diferent contexts, 'Mandra and Tara' as explained by Dr. Raja, is an instance in view. It was a pit-fall to many in the past, and it could now be avoided, with the help of an authoritative version of the text like the present one.

In translating the text, the needs of those who want to follow the sanskrit text in its original form and syntax are given a preference to those of a casually interested reader. Such a procedure needs verbal fidelity and a close adherence to the Sanskrit syntax and the retention of the original technical terms, instead of using their corresponding English synonyms. Over and above the translation, Dr. Raja has elucidated many intricate points that crop up from time to time, by appending his own comments.

There are a few misprints which can be easily corrected by a habitual reader ; one or two however need special correction. Thus in the last line of verse 48 on page 60 of the translation, the word *interval* should have been avoided as it is a technical term in the music of today and conveys the idea of a 'ratio' and not of the śruti-distance. Under verse 50 page 60, 'Ni and Dha have two śrutis'; here it is Ga and not Dha which has two śrutis Similarly lines 11 and 12 on page 60 should read 'thus it is that Ri and Dha on one side, *with* Ga and Ni *respectively* on the other, are discordant. The present sentence leaves ground for misapprehension.

Similarly, Sanskrit terms should be printed in one and the same way, either with capitals or with small letters and the sequence of the original terms and their English synonyms should not be changed on and off, at least in one and the same sentence.

Scholars of Indian music distinctly stand to gain from such a translation as it will enable them to interpret *correctly* the meaning and significance of many terms and passages, which in the past have suffered misrepresentation and distortion at the hands of many interpreters,—interpreters who knew music but not enough Sanskrit and vice versa.

In the end, I would suggest that when the whole of the translation is issued it should be supplemented by a key to the identification of the Rāgas as given in the Ratnākara, with the Rāgas of to-day. If a clue to such a key remains undiscovered I am afraid, the music of the Ratnākara will remain a sealed book as ever.

G. H. R.

BHĀRATĪYA MĀNASAŚĀSTRA-PARIBHĀṢĀ · *Indian Psychological Terminology*, by Professor D. D. Vadekar ; pages 402 ; Bombay Book Depot, Bombay, price Rs. 10.

It is very encouraging indeed to find that educationists in this country are now realising that the best medium of imparting education—even higher education—is the student's own language Vigorous efforts are therefore being made, at several centres of learning, to introduce Indian languages as media of instruction Apart from the unquestioned educational value of such a course, it has a high moral value as well—particularly in a country, like India, which has laboured long under foreign domination. A century of education through the medium of English has created among generations of Indian students an inferiority complex with regard to their own languages and consequently with regard to their past culture and future potentialities Every effort therefore in the direction of facilitating the imparting of education—particularly higher scientific and technical education—through the medium of Indian languages is to be welcomed whole-heartedly. *Indian Psychological Terminology* by Prof D D. Vadekar is one such brilliant effort On account of the multiplicity of principal languages current in this vast country, the problem of a common medium in all centres of learning has become very much complicated. Prof. Vadekar is quite conscious of this. He has therefore tried to evolve, on scientific lines, "Plan and Principles," which would make his terminology suitable for "a basic, common and interprovincial use in the exposition of psychological subjects in all modern Indian languages of established Sanskritic affinities and associations". Prof. Vadekar's work is not an ordinary dictionary. He gives the exact scientific connotation of a technical term and not merely its literal rendering in Indian language For one single term he has suggested several equivalents, thus allowing a wide scope for selection. Two main requisites of a New Terminology are that it has to be significant—*anvarthaka*—and that it has to be simple and easy of currency. Prof. Vadekar's work is quite creditable from this point of view. He has tried to give equivalents which are not

unnecessarily pedantic. In most cases they are quite felicitous. But the real test of such terminology lies in its actual use in scientific works written in Indian languages. It is to be earnestly hoped that scholars will utilise Prof. Vadekar's valuable terminology in large measure, will enrich the scientific literature of India and will thus make it accessible to a larger public.

Prof. Vadekar has planned a whole *Indian Philosophical Terminology*, the present *Psychological* work being its first part. He is rendering great service to Philosophy and Indian Languages alike through his work, and deserves the best thanks of all students and teachers of both the subjects.

—R. N. D.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Anwar Nāma of Abjadi, by Muhammad Husayn Mahvi, University of Madras, 1944

Atharva-Veda-Samhitā, Translated into Tamil, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.

Bālabhāratam of Agastya Pandita, with the commentary Manoharā, of Sālva Timmaya Dandanātha, Part I, cantos I-III, by P P. S Sastri, Shri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1939

Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, Iravas and Culture, change by A. Aiyappan, Madras, 1945.

The Calendar Supplement for 1945, University of Calcutta, 1945.

Debates Commentary, by B. C. Law, Pali Text Society, London, 1940

Dhurtākhyāna of Haribhadra Sūri, by Dr A. N Upadhye, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1944.

Digvijaya Mahākāya, by Pandit Ambalala Premachandra Shah, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1945

Our Educational Effort, Fergusson College through Sixty years, by Prof. S. R. Sharma, Deccan Education Society Poona, 1945.

Education in India Today by Prof. P. M. Limaye, Aryabhushana Press, Poona, 1945

Jagadvijayacchandas of Kavindrācārya, by Dr. C Kunhan Raja, Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner, 1945.

Jayapura Raja Vamsyavali, A History of the Solar Dynasty of Jeypore-Orissa, by Pundit Ramanatha Nanda Sarma, Jeypore Samsthanam, Madras, 1943.

The Theory of Karma, by M G Merchant, Bhavanagar.

Kenopanisad-Bhāsya, by Sri Rangaramanuja, edited by K C. Varadachari and D. T, Tatacharya Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series, Tirupati, 1945.

B C. Law Volume, Part I, Edited by Dr. D. R Bhandarkar etc. The Indian Research Institute, Calcutta, 1945

Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit, by Mm. Prof S Kuppuswami Sastri, Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, 1945

The following six works—

(1) मधुविद्या यागदर्पण
(2) श्रीजयन्तीपारणकालप्रकाशिका
(3) श्रीजयन्तीपारणासमाप्ति
(4) समस्यमानसूक्त्यर्थनिष्कर्षः
(5) हस्तीशवैभवम्
(6) लघ्वाह्निकम् bound together, by Sri Ranga Ramanujaswami Kumbhakonam.

Maharshi and his Message, by Paul Brunton, Madras.

Maha Yoga by Who, Sri Ramanasrama, Tiruvannamala

A Message of Peace to a World full of Unrest, delivered by Sri Swami Tulsiramji Maharaj Bikaner.

Mudrārāksasapūrvasamkathānaka of Anantasarman, by Dasharatha Sharma, Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner, 1945

Nandapur (A Forsaken Kingdom) Part I, by Kumar Bidyadhan Singh Deo, Jeypore, 1938.

Nayamañjarī, by Śrīmad Appayadīksita, edited by P P. S. Sastri Shri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1941.

Parmar Inscription, in Dhar State, 875-1310 A. D, Anand Sagar Press Darbar, Dhar.

पाठशोधनं, by Sri Rangaramanujaswami, Tirupati, 1944.

La Pensèe De Ghazzāli, by Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris VI.

Persian Catalogue, by C V. Joshi, State Records Department, Baroda, 1945.

Pirit Nula Le Fil De Pirit, by Marguerite la Fuente, Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris VI. 1941.

Prabuddha Bharata or Awakened India, Golden Jubilee Number, 1945, Swami Yogeshwarananda, Calcutta, 1945.

Rāgavibodha of Somanātha, by Pandit S. Subrahmanya Sastri, Adyar Library, Adyar, 1945.

Rajasthani Vira-Gita, Part I, Sadul Oriental Series, Volume I, Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner, 1945.

Rāsalīlā Nāma Preksanaka, by Dr. V. Raghavan, 1945.

Ristasamuccaya of Durgadeva, by Dr A. S Gopani, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1945.

Sama Vedam, by M R. Jambunathan, Madras

Samayika Patha, by R. N. Shaha, Shri Vira Granthamālā, Sangali, 1945.

Samdeśa Rāsaka of Abdul Rahaman, by Śrī Jina Vijaya Muni, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1945.

Śatakatrayam, by Prof. D. D. Kosambi, Ānandāśrama, Poona, 1945.

Sāyan Tables of Houses, for Latitudes 8° to 35° North, by R V Vaidya, Astronomical and Astrological Association, Gwalior, 1945

Sivagnana Botham of Meykanda Deva, translated with Notes and Introduction, by J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, Dharmapuram, 1945.

The Slave of Ideas and other plays, by A. S. Panchapakesa Ayyar, C. Coomaraswamy Naidu & Sons, Madras, 1941.

Śṛṅgāraprakāśa Part I Prakāśas 1, 2 by Mahārājādhirāja Sri Bhoja Deva, Edited by P. P. S. Sastri, Shri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1942

Suvarnasaptati Sastra, Sāṅkhya Kārikā Saptati of Īśvara Krsna with a commentary reconstructed into Sanskrit from the Chinese Translation of Paramārtha and edited by N Aiyaswami Sastri, Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series, Tirupati, 1944

Three famous tales, by A S P. Ayyar, G. V. K. Swamy & Co. Kumbakonam

Ta'rikh Nama-I-Harat, (the History of Harat), by Muhammad Z A^a-siddiqui, Calcutta, 1944.

The Royal Jester, or Tenali Rama, by A. S P. Ayyar, K. V. Press, Book Depot, Vellore, 1943.

A Short History of the Terapanthi Sect of the Svetambar Jains and its Tenets, Srichand Rampuria, Calcutta, 1944.

Tirukkural Kamattupal, by T. P. Palaniappa Pillali, Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series, Tirupati, 1945.

Short Stories from the great Upanisads, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.

The following six works—

(1) उक्तिनिष्ठापरित्राणम्
(2) गुणदोषदर्पणः
(3) न्यासोल्लासभावचन्द्रिका
(4) न्यासपरिशुद्धिविमर्शनम्
(5) तत्त्वबोधिनी
(6) दूषणनिराकारणम् bound together, by Sri Ranga Ramanujaswami, Kumbhakonam.

All about the Vedas in Tamil, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.

विक्रमांक (उत्तरार्ध), संवत् २००१ वैक्रम, नागरीप्रचारिणी सभा, काशी.

Ancient Wisdom of Wales, by D. Jeffrey Williams, Adyar Library, Adyar, 1945.

यजुर्वेदशतपथब्राह्मणकथा, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.

Yajurvedam, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE

Mahābhārata Volumes already published	Rs.	As.
Vol. I–Ādiparvan (1), ed., Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M.A., Ph.D. ; Fasc. 1-7 , pp. CXVIII + 996.	33	0
Vol. II–Sabhāparvan (2), ed., Prof. Dr. F. Edgerton , Fasc. 13-14 ; pp. LXVII + 517	12	0
Vols. III & IV–Āranyakaparvan (3) ed., Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M.A., Ph.D. ; Fasc. 11-12 ; pp. XLII + 1111.	18	0
Vol. V–Virāṭaparvan (4), ed., Dr. Raghu Vira, M.A., Ph.D. ; Fasc. 8 , pp. LX + 362.	11	0
Vol. VI–Udyogaparvan (5), ed., Dr. S. K. De, M.A., D.Litt., Fasc. 9-10 , pp. LIV + 739	19	0
Vol	8	0
Vol		
Ta ... i, ... tes	1	0
Ni		
	1	8
De		
V		
	4	0
V		
	4	0
V		
	5	0
	5	0